

STUDIES IN THE VERSIONS OF THE MINOR PROPHETS:  
THEIR TEXT AND THEOLOGICAL BIAS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculties of New College and  
The University of Edinburgh

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Philosophy

---

by  
Shildes Risdon Vail Johnson  
February 1955



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This investigator wishes to express his appreciation for the inspiration, encouragement and assistance given him by his major professors, Rev. Professors Norman W. Porteous, and O. S. Rankin. He also desires to express appreciation for the assistance given him by the libraries and the librarians located at the University of Edinburgh (both the New College and the University libraries), the University of Glasgow, the British Museum, Oxford University, the University of Zürich, and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville. Finally, he appreciates the suggestions and encouragement given by Professor E. C. Rust, formerly Professor at Rowdon Baptist College, Leeds, and now professor at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.



## PREFACE

The title of this dissertation may seem to be more comprehensive than its contents. If so, this has come about because the scope of the investigation of necessity has been narrowed (or restricted) progressively as the author proceeded in his study.

Many points of interest either have been omitted entirely or else have been alluded to very briefly. Some of these are: the intermediary agencies between God and man; phases of the cultic worship; the attitude of the adherents of Judaism toward the kingdoms of Israel and Judah and the surrounding nations; the Hebrew text used by the translators; the exegetical principles of the translators; the relationship to other Jewish writings of the period; the problem of the authorship, date, etc., of the translations; and the type of script found in the translators' documents.

The subjects and passages which are discussed in this thesis have been chosen from the numerous subjects and passages which the author compiled in making a comparison of the Greek and Aramaic translations, individually, with the Masoretic Text as found in Kittel's Biblia Hebraica<sup>1</sup>. The Aramaic Text used, unless otherwise indicated, is the one

---

<sup>1</sup>Kittel, Rud., Biblia Hebraica (third edition; Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1949).

v

found in Lagarde's Prophetæ Chaldaica<sup>1</sup>. The Greek text, usually, is taken from Ziegler's Duodecim Prophetæ<sup>2</sup>, although at times Swete's<sup>3</sup> or Rahlfs' Septuagint<sup>4</sup> are used. The references to Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus are usually from Ziegler or else from Field's Origenis Hexaplorum<sup>5</sup>.

Not always have the subjects, and illustrative passages which follow, been discussed in full detail. In many instances an exhaustive investigation of all pertinent passages soon proved to be fruitless because it became apparent that no consistent theological bias could be established. In certain instances, however, all of the appropriate passages are discussed, either because a comprehensive investigation was warranted to establish or disprove the existence of a theological bias on the part of the translator(s) or else in order to illustrate the fruitlessness of such a complete investigation in every instance. A partial, yet fairly complete, list of passages which were

---

<sup>1</sup>Lagarde, Paul de: Prophetæ Chaldaicae Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1872.

<sup>2</sup>Ziegler, Joseph: Duodecim Prophetæ (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum XIII) Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1943.

<sup>3</sup>Swete, H.B.: The Old Testament in Greek Cambridge: University Press, 1899. 2nd ed., 3 Vols.

<sup>4</sup>Rahlfs, A.: Septuaginta Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1949. 4th ed., 2 Vols.

<sup>5</sup>Field, Fred: Origenis Hexaplorum Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875. 2 Vols.

considered at one time or another for discussion in this dissertation is found in the Introduction.

One more fact should be noted. The determination of possible anti-anthropomorphisms when comparing the Septuagint (or Targum) with the Masoretic Text is very subjective. In many instances this investigator has vacillated in his opinion whether certain translations should be considered as possible anti-anthropomorphisms or not. He also has varied his opinion from time to time as to how fully to treat every anthropomorphic concept discussed in this thesis. The practical limitations of space and this subjective element may have <sup>also</sup> caused this investigator to treat too briefly a given concept or to omit entirely certain passages and anthropomorphic concepts.



## SPECIAL NOTE ON PUNCTUATION, GRAMMAR, AND TRANSLATION

This investigator was taught punctuation and grammar in America in a period of transition during which the system of punctuation changed. Consequently, his punctuation seemingly is not consistent and does not agree with either the older system of punctuation or the present system. In a few places<sup>1</sup> he has consulted American authorities to determine what is the correct current procedure. This was, of course, impossible to do in every instance.

The investigator realizes the disadvantage of the above situation, and he also recognizes the additional misfortune of being unfamiliar with the British system of grammar and punctuation. He hopes, nevertheless, that those who read this dissertation will not be inconvenienced too greatly because of this.

The investigator usually has used for his translation of the Masoretic Text, The Holy Bible Revised Standard Version (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1952), and for his translation of the Septuagint, Pells, S. F. (ed.), The Old Covenant Commonly Called the Old Testament Translated from the Septuagint by Charles Thomson (London: Skeffington and Son, 1914). Unfortunately no English translation of the Targum was

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, the quotations on pages 11, 52, 73, 97, 207, 229, and 316. An example of an instance where current American grammatical authorities were consulted occurs on page 44.

available. Hence the translations cited are at times based on those given by commentators<sup>1</sup> or are at times his own compared with the Latin translation of the Aramaic<sup>2</sup>. In the last instance his translation may be of an alternate<sup>we</sup> text or may be a rather free rendering.

The investigator, moreover, has been compelled to utilize four Hebrew and three Greek typewriters to insert the Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew characters. His language typists have been so slow and inaccurate that the typing has taken about a year and has necessitated his printing some characters by hand.

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Jonah 3:9, page 319.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Zephaniah 3:7, page 315.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## SECTION I. The Anti-Anthropomorphic Tendencies of the Masoretic Text of the Book of the Twelve Prophets.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. The Anti-Anthropomorphic Tendencies of the Masoretic Text . . . . .	1
1. The Use of Intermediaries . . . . .	3
Angel of Yahweh . . . . .	3
Presence of Yahweh . . . . .	4
Glory of Yahweh . . . . .	7
Name of Yahweh . . . . .	9
2. The Anti-Anthropomorphism of the Sopherim	12
Emendations . . . . .	13
Protection of Tetragrammaton and other Divine Names . . . . .	16
3. The Editorial Alterations . . . . .	18
(1) The Judaistic Editor of Hosea . .	19
(2) The Anti-High Place Editor . . . .	20
(3) The Late Exilic Editor . . . . .	21
(4) The Anti-Neighbor Editor . . . . .	22
(5) The Messianist . . . . .	23
(6) The Nationalistic School of Editors	23
(7) The Day of Yahweh Editor . . . . .	24
(8) The Eschatologists . . . . .	24
(9) The Doxologist . . . . .	25
(10) The Anti-Idol Polemist . . . . .	25
(11) The Psalm Editor . . . . .	26
(12) The Early Scribes . . . . .	26
(13) The Later Scribal Schools . . . .	27



4. The Masoretic Changes . . . . .	29
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	32

SECTION II. The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Septuagint  
Translation of the Book of The Twelve Prophets

CHAPTER	PAGE
II. The Theological Alterations of the Septuagint: The Grosser Anthropomorphisms . . . . .	32
1. The Description of God in Terms which Imply that He has a Complete Human or Physical Form . . . . .	37
2. The Possession By God of Parts of the Human Body . . . . .	51
(1) The Face of God . . . . .	51
(2) The Eyes of God . . . . .	54
(3) The Mouth of God . . . . .	61
(4) The Hands and Arms of God . . . . .	68
(5) The Feet of God . . . . .	71
3. Anti-Animistic Alterations . . . . .	73
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	76
III. The Theological Alterations of the Septuagint: The Lesser Anthropomorphisms . . . . .	78
1. The Anti-Anthropopathisms of the Septuagint . . . . .	78
(1) The Indignation of God . . . . .	79
(2) Compassionate Expressions Applied to Deity . . . . .	84
(3) The Emotions of Pleasure and Desire Ascribed to Deity . . . . .	86
(4) God's Hatred . . . . .	88
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	90
2. Anthropomorphic Actions of Deity Which are Altered . . . . .	91

3. Alterations of Passages Which Give God Certain Anthropomorphic Possessions . . . . .	99
4. Relationships Between Men and God Which Imply Physical Form to Deity . . . . .	99
(1) Actions Directed Against God . . . . .	100
(2) The Visible Appearance of God . . . . .	107
(3) Seeking Refuge in God . . . . .	108
(4) Being Strong in God . . . . .	110
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	111
IV. Further Alterations Concerning the Doctrine of God in the Septuagint . . . . .	113
1. The Omnipresence of God . . . . .	113
(1) The Denial of Motion to Deity . . . . .	114
(2) The Denial of Place to God . . . . .	121
2. The Omniscience of God . . . . .	130
3. The Unchangeableness of God . . . . .	136
4. The Implication of Divinity to a Created Being . . . . .	138
5. The Protection of God and His Character . . . . .	139
6. Monotheistic Elements . . . . .	149
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	149
V. The Anthropomorphic Tendency of the Septuagint . . . . .	150
1. The Description of God as a Human Being . . . . .	151
2. The Possession by God of Parts of the Human Body . . . . .	155
3. Action of Men Towards Deity which Convey Anthropomorphic Implications . . . . .	165
4. Anthropomorphic Actions of Deity . . . . .	168
5. Anthropopathisms in the Septuagint . . . . .	175
6. Passages Which in the Masoretic Text Avoid Describing God as Moving but which, in the Septuagint, Ascribe Motion to Deity . . . . .	178

7. Passages in which the Masoretic Text, More than the Septuagint, Safeguards the Concept of God's Character, etc. . . . .	182
8. Conclusion . . . . .	186

### SECTION III. The Theological Alterations of the Targum to the Twelve

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. The Theological Alterations of the Targum to the Twelve: The Grosser Anthropomorphisms . . . . .	190
Introductory Remarks . . . . .	190
1. The Ascription to Deity of Human (Physical) Form . . . . .	192
(1) Hosea 2:4(2) . . . . .	192
(2) Hosea 11:9 . . . . .	193
(3) Hosea 11:4 E . . . . .	193
(4) Hosea 2:25(23) . . . . .	194
(5) Amos 9:15 . . . . .	196
(6) God Pictured as Feeding or Tending .	197
(7) God as Israel's Husband . . . . .	199
(8) God's Soul (Nephesh) . . . . .	202
(9) God's Spirit . . . . .	203
(10) God Compared to a Father and Master	206
(11) God Portrayed as King . . . . .	209
(12) God Pictured as a Witness . . . . .	210
(13) The Concept of God Being Weary . . .	211
2. Description of God as having Parts of the Human Body . . . . .	211
(1) The Hand and Arm (Shoulder) of God .	212
(2) The Eyes of God . . . . .	217



(3) The Feet of God . . . . .	224
(4) The Mouth of God . . . . .	226
(5) The Face of God . . . . .	233
(6) The Nose of God . . . . .	234
(7) The Heart of God . . . . .	235
(8) The Mind of God . . . . .	235
(9) The Ears of God . . . . .	238
3. Anti-Animistic Tendencies of the Targum . . . . .	239
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	242
VII. The Theological Alterations of the Targum: The Lesser Anthropomorphisms . . . . .	243
1. The Anti-Anthropopathic Expressions of the Targum . . . . .	243
(1) The Concept of God Being Jealous . . . . .	243
(2) The Concept that God Hates . . . . .	246
(3) The Concept of God Repenting . . . . .	247
(4) The Concept of God Being Sorry . . . . .	250
(5) The Concept of God's Anger . . . . .	251
(6) The Concept of God Being Indignant . . . . .	253
(7) The Concept of Deity as Having Pleasure or Desire . . . . .	255
2. Alterations in the Targum Regarding God's Possessions . . . . .	259
3. Actions of Deity Which are Anthropomorphic . . . . .	263
(1) God Described as Saving . . . . .	263
(2) God Described as Finding . . . . .	265
(3) God Described as Hedging or Walling Up . . . . .	265
(4) God Depicted as a Healer . . . . .	266
(5) The Description of Deity as Defending . . . . .	268

(6) The Description of God as Spreading Out . . . . .	268
(7) The Description of God as Teaching (Showing) . . . . .	269
(8) Other Anthropomorphic Descriptions of Deity . . . . .	271
4. Actions of Men Towards God Which Imply that He is Anthropomorphic . . . . .	273
(1) Knowing God . . . . .	273
(2) Tempting God . . . . .	275
(3) Hearing God . . . . .	276
(4) Calling (Crying) to God . . . . .	277
(5) Seeing God . . . . .	279
(6) Leaning on God . . . . .	281
(7) Seeking God . . . . .	282
(8) Coming Before (or Meeting) God . . . . .	285
(9) Walking With (Going After) God . . . . .	286
(10) Departing from God . . . . .	287
(11) Rebelling Against God . . . . .	290
(12) Other Actions Against Deity . . . . .	292
(13) Hiding from God . . . . .	296
(14) Fearing (Worshipping) God . . . . .	297
(15) Serving God . . . . .	298
(16) Returning to God . . . . .	299
(17) Believing, Etc., in God . . . . .	300
(18) Remembering and Forgetting God . . . . .	302
(19) Hating God . . . . .	303
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	304
VIII. Further Alterations Concerning the Doctrine of God in the Targum . . . . .	305

1. The Omnipresence of Deity . . . . .	305
(1) The Denial of Place to Deity . . . . .	305
(2) The Denial of Motion to Deity . . . . .	317
2. The Unchangeableness of God . . . . .	323
3. The Omniscience of God . . . . .	324
4. The Safeguarding of the Targumist's Concept of the Character of Deity . . . . .	326
IX. The Anti-Anthropomorphic and Protective Devices Used in the Targum . . . . .	330
1. The Fear and/or Worship of Deity . . . . .	330
(1) The Worship (פולחן) of God . . . . .	331
(2) The Fear (פחד) of God . . . . .	334
(3) The Relationship Between פולחן and פחד . . . . .	335
2. The Will (רעותא) of God . . . . .	336
3. The Glory (קרא) of God . . . . .	336
4. The Power (גבורתא) of God . . . . .	337
5. The Shekinah (שכינא) of God . . . . .	339
6. The Memra (ממרא) of God . . . . .	341
(1) The Use of Memra to Avoid Anthropo- morphic Expressions . . . . .	344
(2) The Relationship of the Memra to the Shekinah . . . . .	350
7. The Distinctive Use of these Devices in the Targum . . . . .	351
8. Conclusion . . . . .	354
APPENDIX I. Cultic Protection in the Septuagint . . . . .	356
II. The Intermediary Agents in the Septuagint . . . . .	365
III. The Attitude of the Greek Translator Towards the Heathen and the Former Kingdoms of Israel and Judah . . . . .	378



	xvi
IV. Cultic Protection (in the Targum) . . .	392
V. The Intermediary Devices of the Targum	400
VI. The Attitude of the Targumist Towards the Heathen and the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah . . . . .	403
VII. Anthropomorphic Passages in the Targum	407
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	411
INDEX . . . . .	436

Q5VVE213 Q5E21

## INTRODUCTION

Although this thesis is mainly concerned with the two earliest translations of the Hebrew Bible, the author fully recognizes that the nature, character, and reliability of our received text, i.e., the Masoretic Text, is of supreme importance. Fortunately, today, the essential reliability of the Masoretic Text is accepted by most scholars. Sometimes, however, this unquestioning acceptance has been pushed almost beyond the bounds of credibility. For the purpose of this investigation, however, there are very few instances where, as a starting point at least, the received Hebrew Text may not be accepted as it is for the basis of making comparison with the Greek and Aramaic Versions.

The basic concern of this thesis is with the anti-anthropomorphic tendencies which may be observed clearly in the Targum and which have long been assumed to be present also in the Septuagint. This anti-anthropomorphic tendency arose in Judaism as the Jewish people gained in knowledge and as their zealous devotion to the worship of the One Transcendent, Holy Being increased. The changes introduced, directly or indirectly, in the main were concerned with an attempt to avoid the ascription of the grosser anthropomorphic<sup>1</sup> qualities to Deity.

---

<sup>1</sup>Used here in the very broadest possible sense -- including the ascription to Deity of any physical or emotional likeness to any created thing, animate or inanimate.

## 1. DIRECT LIKENESS TO MANKIND

Frequently, in the Book of the Twelve, God is said to be like (כ) men<sup>1</sup>. No passage occurs which precisely states that God is a man, and one passage clearly states that He is not man<sup>2</sup>. Yet the characteristics of humanity are implied when God is likened to a farmer<sup>3</sup> or is said to sow<sup>4</sup>, plant<sup>5</sup>, feed<sup>6</sup>, or shepherd (tend)<sup>7</sup>.

This anthropomorphism is felt strongly when people call God "the husband"<sup>8</sup> of Israel, when Israel is called His wife<sup>9</sup>, and when He says that He will betroth Israel to Himself<sup>10</sup>. This picturization also is seen in attributing a nephesh<sup>11</sup> (personality) and a spirit<sup>12</sup> to God, and to a lesser extent an anthropomorphic tendency is noted when He is described as

<sup>1</sup>Malachi 3:17 (אִישׁ).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 11:9 (אִישׁ) -- an anti-anthropomorphism.

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 11:4.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 2:25(23); Zechariah 10:9 (זָרַע).

<sup>5</sup>Amos 9:15 (נָטַע).

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 11:4 (אָכַל); Hosea 4:16 (רָעָה).

<sup>7</sup>Micah 7:14 (רָעָה).

<sup>8</sup>Hosea 2:4(2), 9(7), 18(16) (אִישׁ).

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 2:4(2), (אִשָּׁה).

<sup>10</sup>Hosea 2:21(19)f. (אִישׁ).

<sup>11</sup>Amos 6:8; Zechariah 11:8 (נֶפֶשׁ).

<sup>12</sup>Micah 2:7; 3:8; Haggai 2:5 (רוּחַ); cf. Joel 3:1(2:28); 2(2:29); Zechariah 4:6; 6:8; 7:12.

being a father<sup>1</sup> (and disciplines<sup>2</sup>), a judge<sup>3</sup> (or that He judges<sup>4</sup>), a master<sup>5</sup>, a king<sup>6</sup> (or that He reigns<sup>7</sup>), and a witness<sup>8</sup> (or that he testifies<sup>9</sup>).

Moreover, God is described as being wearied<sup>10</sup>, working<sup>11</sup>, fighting<sup>12</sup>, riding<sup>13</sup>, inheriting<sup>14</sup> (and having an inheritance<sup>15</sup>), refining<sup>16</sup>, trying<sup>17</sup> (metal), and purify-

---

<sup>1</sup>Malachi 1:6 (אב).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 7:12,15(14); 10:10 (יסר); Hosea 5:2 (מוסר); cf. Hosea 1:4; 2:15(13); 4:9,14; 12:3(2); Amos 3:2,14; Zephaniah 1:8,9,12; 3:7; Zechariah 10:3 (על + פקר = punish).

<sup>3</sup>Micah 4:14(5:1) (שפט).

<sup>4</sup>Joel 4(3):2,12; Micah 4:3 (שפט); cf. Micah 4:3; Habakkuk 1:12 (יכה).

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 12:15; Micah 4:13; Zechariah 4:14; 6:5; Malachi 1:6; 3:1 (אדון).

<sup>6</sup>Zechariah 14:9,16,17; Malachi 1:14 (מלך).

<sup>7</sup>Micah 4:7 (מלך).

<sup>8</sup>Micah 1:2; Malachi 3:5 (עד).

<sup>9</sup>Malachi 2:14 (עוד).

<sup>10</sup>Malachi 2:17; cf. Habakkuk 2:13 (יגע).

<sup>11</sup>Habakkuk 3:2 (פעל).

<sup>12</sup>Zechariah 14:3 (לחם).

<sup>13</sup>Habakkuk 3:8 (רכב).

<sup>14</sup>Zechariah 2:16(12) (נחל); cf. Zechariah 9:4 (ירש - hiphil).

<sup>15</sup>Joel 2:17; 4(3):2; Micah 7:14,18 (נחלה).

<sup>16</sup>Zechariah 13:9; Malachi 3:2,3 (צרף).

<sup>17</sup>Zechariah 13:9; Malachi 3:10,15 (בחן).



ing<sup>1</sup> (metal).

## 2. ASCRIBING TO GOD PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

In the Twelve<sup>2</sup> God is referred to as having many of the parts of the human body. He is described as having a mouth<sup>3</sup> and, consequently, is able to eat<sup>4</sup>, blow a trumpet<sup>5</sup>, blow<sup>6</sup>, and hiss (whistle)<sup>7</sup>. Moreover, He is said to possess a voice<sup>8</sup> and, therefore, He speaks<sup>9</sup>, answers<sup>10</sup>, calls<sup>11</sup>, declares<sup>12</sup>, swears<sup>13</sup>, curses<sup>14</sup>, and the like (but at times

<sup>1</sup>Malachi 3:3 (טהר).

<sup>2</sup>Here and hereafter the Twelve means the Minor Prophets or the Book of the Twelve Prophets.

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 6:5; Micah 4:4 (פה).

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 13:8 (אכל).

<sup>5</sup>Zechariah 9:14 (חקע).

<sup>6</sup>Haggai 1:9 (נפח).

<sup>7</sup>Zechariah 10:8 (שרק).

<sup>8</sup>Joel 2:11; 4(3):16; Amos 1:2; Micah 6:9; Haggai 1:12; Zechariah 6:15 (קול).

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 12:11; Joel 4(3):8; Amos 3:1,8; Obadiah 18; Micah 4:4; Habakkuk 2:1 (דבר); cf. Habakkuk 3:2 (שמע).

<sup>10</sup>Hosea 2:23(21); 14:9; Joel 2:19; Jonah 2:3; Micah 3:4; Habakkuk 2:2; Zechariah 1:13; 10:6; 13:9 (ענה); cf. Micah 3:7 (מענה).

<sup>11</sup>Hosea 11:1; Joel 3:5(2:32); Amos 5:8; 7:4; 9:6; Micah 6:9; Haggai 1:11; Zechariah 7:7,13 (קרא).

<sup>12</sup>Amos 4:13; Zechariah 9:12 (נזר, hiphil).

<sup>13</sup>Amos 4:2; 6:8; 8:7; Micah 7:20 (שבע).

<sup>14</sup>Malachi 2:2 (ארר).

may be silent<sup>1</sup>).

In the Twelve, God is said to possess a face<sup>2</sup> and eyes<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, He can see<sup>4</sup>. Moreover, the word for nose (אף) is used always with the metaphorical sense of anger to describe God, although the sense of smelling<sup>5</sup> may not be denied to Him.

He also may have shoulders (or arms<sup>6</sup>) and hands<sup>7</sup>. Hence, He can write<sup>8</sup>, strike (smite<sup>9</sup> or pierce<sup>10</sup>), hurl (cast<sup>11</sup>),

<sup>1</sup>Habakkuk 1:13; Zephaniah 3:17 (חרש).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 5:15; 6:2; 7:2; Jonah 1:2,3,10; Micah 3:4; Nahum 1:5; Habakkuk 2:20; 3:5; Zephaniah 1:7; Haggai 1:12; 2:14; Zechariah 2:17(13); 7:2; 8:21,22; Malachi 1:9; 3:1,14,16 (פנים).

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 13:14; Amos 9:3,4,8; Jonah 2:5; Habakkuk 1:13; Zechariah 4:10; 8:6; 9:1,8; 12:4; Malachi 2:17 (עין).

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 6:10; 9:10; Jonah 3:10; Habakkuk 1:13; 3:6; Zechariah 9:8 (ראה); Amos 5:22; Habakkuk 1:13 (נבט); Zechariah 3:15; Malachi 2:13 (סנה); Hosea 13:7; 14:9(8) (שור).

<sup>5</sup>Amos 5:21 (ריח).

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 11:3 (זרוע).

<sup>7</sup>Hosea 2:12(10); Amos 1:8; 7:7; 9:2; Micah 5:9(8)?; Habakkuk 3:4; Zephaniah 1:4; 2:13; Zechariah 2:13(9); 13:7 (יד).

<sup>8</sup>Hosea 8:12 (כתב).

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 6:1; Amos 3:15; 4:9; Zechariah 12:4 (נכה); Zechariah 14:12,18 (נוף).

<sup>10</sup>Habakkuk 3:14 (נקב).

<sup>11</sup>Jonah 1:4 (סול); Zechariah 7:14 (סער); Jonah 2:4; Micah 7:19; Nahum 3:6 (שלך - hiphil).

touch<sup>1</sup>, and shake (one's hand)<sup>2</sup>. Likewise, He has feet<sup>3</sup> and is capable of standing<sup>4</sup> and treading<sup>5</sup> (tramping). He also has a heart<sup>6</sup>.

In the Twelve God is not described specifically as having ears, but the Masoretic Text states that He can hear<sup>7</sup>. Likewise there is no direct statement that He has an intellect, but His possession of an intellect or mind certainly is assumed when it states that God knows<sup>8</sup>, remembers<sup>9</sup>, forgets<sup>10</sup>, thinks<sup>11</sup>, (and, therefore, has thoughts<sup>12</sup> and a counsel<sup>13</sup>), and the like.

### 3. ACTIONS OF GOD WHICH IMPLY HUMAN OR PHYSICAL FORM

---

<sup>1</sup>Amos 9:5; Zechariah 2:12(8)? (נוע).

<sup>2</sup>Zechariah 2:13(9) (נור).

<sup>3</sup>Nahum 1:3; Habakkuk 3:5; Zechariah 14:4 (רגל).

<sup>4</sup>For these, see under place.

<sup>5</sup>Amos 4:13; Micah 1:3; Habakkuk 3:15; Zechariah 9:13 (דרך).

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 11:8 (לב).

<sup>7</sup>Amos 5:23; Jonah 2:3; Micah 7:7; Habakkuk 1:2; Zephaniah 2:8; Zechariah 7:13; Malachi 3:16 (שמע); Malachi 3:16 (קשב).

<sup>8</sup>Hosea 5:3,9; 8:4; 13:5; Amos 3:2; 5:12; Nahum 1:7 (ידע).

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 7:2; 8:13; 9:9; Habakkuk 3:2 (זכר).

<sup>10</sup>Hosea 4:6; Amos 8:7 (שכח).

<sup>11</sup>Jonah 1:6 (עשה); Micah 2:3 (חשב).

<sup>12</sup>Amos 4:13 (שה); Micah 4:12 (מחשבה).

<sup>13</sup>Micah 4:12 (עצה?).

In many places God is described as saving or delivering<sup>1</sup>, being a saviour<sup>2</sup>, producing salvation<sup>3</sup>, and defending<sup>4</sup>. He also spreads out<sup>5</sup>, hews<sup>6</sup>, breaks<sup>7</sup>, sells<sup>8</sup>, shows<sup>9</sup>, engraves<sup>10</sup>, hedges<sup>11</sup>, walls up<sup>12</sup>, heals<sup>13</sup>, gathers<sup>14</sup>, and finds<sup>15</sup>.

#### 4. ACTIONS OF MEN TOWARDS GOD WHICH ARE ANTHROPOMORPHIC IN THEIR IMPLICATIONS

---

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 2:11(9); Zechariah 11:6 ( נצל - hiphil); Hosea 1:7; 13:4; Habakkuk 1:2; Zephaniah 3:17,19; Zechariah 8:7, 13; 9:9,16; 10:6; 12:7 ( ישע ).

<sup>2</sup>Micah 7:7; Habakkuk 3:18 ( ישע ).

<sup>3</sup>Habakkuk 3:13 ( ישע ).

<sup>4</sup>Zechariah 9:15; 12:8 ( גון ).

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 7:12; Zechariah 2:10(6) ( פרש ); Zephaniah 1:4; 2:13; Zechariah 12:1; cf. Hosea 11:4 (incline) - ( נטה ).

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 6:6(5) ( חצב ).

<sup>7</sup>Nahum 1:6 ( נהץ ); Hosea 10:2 ( ערף ); Hosea 1:5; 2:20 (18); Amos 1:5; Nahum 1:13 ( שבר ); cf. Habakkuk 3:9 ( בקע = "cleave").

<sup>8</sup>Joel 4(3):8 ( מכר ).

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 11:3 ( רגל - hiphil); Hosea 10:12; Micah 4:2; cf. Hosea 6:3 ( ירה ); Amos 7:1,4,7; 8:1; Micah 7:15; Nahum 3:5; Habakkuk 1:3; Zechariah 2:3(1:20); 3:1 ( ראה - hiphil).

<sup>10</sup>Zechariah 3:9 ( פחה ).

<sup>11</sup>Hosea 2:8(6) ( שוד ).

<sup>12</sup>Hosea 2:8(6); Amos 9:11 ( גדר ).

<sup>13</sup>Hosea 6:1; 7:1; 11:3; 14:5 ( רפא ).

<sup>14</sup>Micah 2:12(11); 4:6; Zephaniah 3:8,18; Zechariah 14:2 ( אסף ); Hosea 8:10; Joel 4(3):2; Micah 2:12; 4:6,12; Zephaniah 3:8,19,20; Zechariah 10:8,10 ( קבץ ).

<sup>15</sup>Hosea 9:10 ( מצא ).



Generally, these actions imply physical form, personality, and the like, but a few imply that God has certain parts of the human body. Thus, in order for men to hear God<sup>1</sup>, the implication is that He possesses a mouth and/or a voice, and for man to be able to call<sup>2</sup> or cry<sup>3</sup> to God assumes that He has ears with which to hear their cries.

Usually these actions of men towards God ascribe a visible, physical form to Him. Thus to see God<sup>4</sup>, to lean<sup>5</sup> or take refuge<sup>6</sup> in Him; to seek<sup>7</sup> God; to meet<sup>8</sup> Him, to approach<sup>9</sup> Him, to depart from Him<sup>10</sup>, to go after (walk with)<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Zechariah 1:4; 7:11 (קשב); Hosea 9:17; Amos 8:11; Micah 6:1; Habakkuk 3:2; Zechariah 1:4; 7:11 (שמע).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 2:18(16); 7:7; Joel 1:19; 3:5(2:32); Jonah 1:6,14; 2:3; 3:8; Zechariah 7:13; 13:9 (קרא).

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 7:14; Joel 1:14; Jonah 1:5; Micah 3:4; Habakkuk 1:2 (זעק).

<sup>4</sup>Zechariah 12:10 (נובט); Amos 9:1; Habakkuk 3:10; Zechariah 9:14; Malachi 3:2 (ראה); Micah 7:7 (צפה).

<sup>5</sup>Micah 3:11 (שען).

<sup>6</sup>Nahum 1:7 (חסה).

<sup>7</sup>Hosea 10:12; Amos 5:4,6; Zephaniah 1:6 (דרש); Hosea 3:5; 5:6,15; 7:10; Zephaniah 1:6; 2:3; Zechariah 8:21f; Malachi 3:1 (בקש).

<sup>8</sup>Amos 4:12 (קרא).

<sup>9</sup>Micah 6:6 (קדם).

<sup>10</sup>Hosea 1:2 (אחר); Hosea 7:13 (נדר); cf. Hosea 4:10 (עזב); Hosea 12:1 (11:12 - רוד); Hosea 2:7(5)?; 3:3?; 4:10?,12,13,14,15,16; 5:3; 9:1 (זנח).

<sup>11</sup>Hosea 2:9(7); 11:10; Micah 6:8 (חלד).

Him, to rebel<sup>1</sup>, transgress<sup>2</sup>, be treacherous<sup>3</sup> towards God, or be against God<sup>4</sup> -- all these imply that He is a person with a physical form. Furthermore, to know<sup>5</sup> God, to test (try)<sup>6</sup> Him, to weary<sup>7</sup> or surround<sup>8</sup> Him, to fear<sup>9</sup> and serve<sup>10</sup> God, and to return<sup>11</sup> to God--all these actions of men have similar implications.

To a lesser extent the same implications are to be made when men are described as believing<sup>12</sup>, rejoicing<sup>13</sup>, and

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 7:14; cf. Malachi 2:8; 3:7 (סור); Hosea 14:1 (מרר).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 7:13; Zephaniah 3:11 (פסע); cf. Hosea 8:1; 14:10; Amos 4:4.

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 5:7; 6:7; cf. Habakkuk 1:13; Malachi 2:11,16 (נדר).

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 13:9.

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 2:22(20); 4:1,6(?); 5:4; 6:3,7(6); 8:2; 13:4; Habakkuk 2:14? (ירע).

<sup>6</sup>See page xix, footnote 17.

<sup>7</sup>See page xix, footnote 10.

<sup>8</sup>Hosea 12:1 (11:12 - סבב).

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 10:3; Joel 2:21,22; Jonah 1:5,10,16; Micah 7:17; Habakkuk 3:2; Zephaniah 3:7; Haggai 1:12; Zechariah 8:13?, 15?; Malachi 2:5; 3:5 (איר) - cf. Zephaniah 3:16; Haggai 2:5 - Hosea 3:5; Micah 7:17 (פחד).

<sup>10</sup>Zephaniah 3:9; Malachi 3:14,17,18 (עבר).

<sup>11</sup>Hosea 3:5; 5:4; 6:1; 7:10; 12:7(6); 14:2,3; Amos 4:6, 8,9,10,11; Joel 2:12,13; Zechariah 1:3; Malachi 3:7,18 (שוב); cf. Haggai 2:17.

<sup>12</sup>Jonah 3:5 (אמן - hiphil); Zephaniah 3:2 (בטח).

<sup>13</sup>Joel 2:23 (שמח); Habakkuk 3:18 (עלי); Joel 2:23; Habakkuk 3:18; Zechariah 10:7 (גיל).

being strong<sup>1</sup> in God, or are said to forget Him<sup>2</sup>, to remember<sup>3</sup> God, and to hate<sup>4</sup> God. Likewise, men scarcely could be said to speak<sup>5</sup> against, to profane<sup>6</sup>, to devise<sup>7</sup> evil, and to rise against<sup>8</sup> God if God were not considered to have some sort of a tangible form.

## 5. ANIMISTIC<sup>9</sup> DESCRIPTIONS OF DEITY

Infrequently God is compared to various forms of creation, and once the name, Rock<sup>10</sup>, is used as a Divine Name. Uncommonly, He is likened to dew<sup>11</sup>, light<sup>12</sup>, a fir<sup>13</sup>, a lion<sup>14</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup>Zechariah 10:12 ( גבר - piel ); Zechariah 12:5 ( אסך ).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 2:15(13); 8:14; 13:6; cf. 4:6 ( שכח ).

<sup>3</sup>Jonah 2:8; Zechariah 10:9 ( זכר ) - cf. hiphil in Amos 6:10.

<sup>4</sup>Zechariah 11:8 ( בחל ).

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 7:13; Malachi 3:13; cf. Zechariah 13:3 ( דבר ב ).

<sup>6</sup>Amos 2:7; Zephaniah 3:4; Malachi 1:12; 2:10,11 ( חלל ).

<sup>7</sup>Hosea 7:15; Nahum 1:9,11 ( חשב ).

<sup>8</sup>Micah 2:8 ( קום - piel ).

<sup>9</sup>This section includes all the descriptions of God which liken Him unto animate or inanimate objects.

<sup>10</sup>Habakkuk 1:12 ( צור ).

<sup>11</sup>Hosea 14:6 ( טל ).

<sup>12</sup>Micah 7:8 ( אור ).

<sup>13</sup>Hosea 14:9 ( ברוש ).

<sup>14</sup>Hosea 5:14; 13:7 ( שחל ); Hosea 13:8 ( לביא ); Hosea 5:14 ( בפיר ); Hosea 11:10 ( אריה ).

a leopard<sup>1</sup>, a bear<sup>2</sup>, a moth<sup>3</sup>, a wall<sup>4</sup>, rottenness<sup>5</sup>, fire<sup>6</sup>, and the like. God also is described as roaring<sup>7</sup>.

#### 6. THE ASCRIPTION OF EMOTIONS TO DEITY

While the usual range of human emotions is applied to God, anthropopathisms are less frequent than anthropomorphisms. Thus, God exhibits the desirable emotions of compassion<sup>8</sup> (especially that of repentance<sup>9</sup>), which induces Him to spare<sup>10</sup> and pity<sup>11</sup> people, etc. He also, however, hates<sup>12</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 13:7 ( נמר ).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 13:8 ( דב ).

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 5:12 ( עש ).

<sup>4</sup>Zechariah 2:9(5) ( חומה ).

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 5:12 ( רקב ).

<sup>6</sup>Amos 5:6 ( אש ).

<sup>7</sup>Hosea 11:10; Joel 4(3); 16; Amos 1:2 ( שאנ ).

<sup>8</sup>Hosea 1:6,7; 2:6(4),25(23); 14:4; Micah 7:19; Habakkuk 3:2; Zechariah 1:12; 10:6 ( רחם ); Zechariah 1:16 ( רחמים ).

<sup>9</sup>Joel 2:13,14; Amos 7:3,6(5); Jonah 3:9,10; 4:2; Zechariah 1:17; 8:14 ( נחם ); Hosea 11:8 ( נחומים ).

<sup>10</sup>Joel 2:18; Zechariah 11:6; Malachi 3:17 ( חסל ).

<sup>11</sup>Joel 2:17; Jonah 4:11 ( חוס ).

<sup>12</sup>Amos 6:8 ( חנף ); Hosea 9:15; Amos 5:21; 6:8; Zechariah 8:17; Malachi 1:3; 2:16 ( שונא ).



is jealous<sup>1</sup>, becomes angry<sup>2</sup>, has indignation<sup>3</sup>, and the like. He is at times pleased<sup>4</sup> and shows delight<sup>5</sup>.

## 7. THE ASCRIPTION OF PLACE AND MOTION TO GOD

Like mankind, God at times is considered to have a particular place<sup>6</sup> or habitation<sup>7</sup>, e.g., He has a particular temple<sup>8</sup> which is His special dwelling-place. In other words, God is not strictly omnipresent and certainly not always transcendent when He is conceived as dwelling<sup>9</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup>Zephaniah 1:18; 3:8; Zechariah 1:14; 8:2 (קנאה); Joel 2:18; Zechariah 1:14; 8:2 (קנא); Nahum 1:2 (קנוא).

<sup>2</sup>Habakkuk 3:8; Zechariah 10:3 (חרה); Hosea 8:5 (חלה); Zechariah 1:2,15 (קצה); Zechariah 1:2,15; 7:12 (קצה); Micah 5:15(14); Nahum 1:2,6; Zechariah 8:2 (חסה); Hosea 5:10; 13:11; Habakkuk 3:8; Zephaniah 1:18 (עברה); Hosea 11:9; Jonah 3:9; Nahum 1:6; Zephaniah 2:2; 3:8 (חרון); Habakkuk 3:2 (רנו); Hosea 8:5; 11:9; 13:11; 14:5; Jonah 3:9; Micah 5:15(14); 7:18; Nahum 1:3,6; Habakkuk 3:8, 12; Zephaniah 2:2,3; 3:8; Zechariah 10:3 (אף).

<sup>3</sup>Zechariah 1:12; Malachi 1:4 (זעם); Nahum 1:6; Habakkuk 3:12; Zephaniah 3:8 (זעם); Micah 7:9 (זעף).

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 9:4; Malachi 3:4 (ערב); Hosea 8:13; Amos 5:22; Micah 6:7; Haggai 1:8; Malachi 1:10,13 (רצה).

<sup>5</sup>Malachi 1:10 (חפץ); Hosea 6:7(6); Jonah 1:14; Micah 7:18; Malachi 2:17 (חפץ).

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 5:15; Micah 1:3 (מקום).

<sup>7</sup>Zechariah 2:17(13) (מעון).

<sup>8</sup>Jonah 2:8; Micah 1:2; Habakkuk 2:20; Malachi 3:1 (היכל).

<sup>9</sup>Joel 4(3):17,21; Zechariah 2:14(10), 15(11); 8:3 (שכן).

sitting<sup>1</sup>, standing<sup>2</sup>, visiting<sup>3</sup>, encamping<sup>4</sup>, and the like. God also lives on high<sup>5</sup>, has chambers<sup>6</sup> of His own, and has a resting place<sup>7</sup>. He may at times be in the midst of<sup>8</sup>, or with<sup>9</sup>, a certain people or place. Finally, the idea of hiding<sup>10</sup> from God is consistent with the concept of a Deity who is not everywhere present.

Frequently, in the Twelve, God also is referred to as moving from place to place. He is described as going (or walking)<sup>11</sup>, coming<sup>12</sup>, going forth<sup>13</sup>, going down<sup>14</sup>, coming

---

<sup>1</sup>Joel 4(3):12; Malachi 3:3? (יֵשֵׁב).

<sup>2</sup>Amos 7:7; 9:1 (נָצַב); Habakkuk 3:6; Zechariah 14:4 (עָמַד).

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 8:13; 9:9; Amos 3:14; Zephaniah 2:7; Zechariah 10:3; 11:16 (מָקַד).

<sup>4</sup>Zechariah 9:8 (חָנָה).

<sup>5</sup>Micah 6:6 (מְרוֹם).

<sup>6</sup>Amos 9:6 (מַעְלָה).

<sup>7</sup>Zechariah 9:1 (מִנְחָה).

<sup>8</sup>Zechariah 2:9(5), 14(10), 15(11); 8:3 (חֵיךְ); Hosea 11:9; Joel 2:27; Amos 5:17; Micah 3:11; Zephaniah 3:5,15,17 (קָרַב).

<sup>9</sup>Amos 5:14; Haggai 1:13; 2:5(4); Zechariah 8:23; 10:5 (אִם or עַם); cf. Micah 2:13 (רָאָה).

<sup>10</sup>Amos 9:3 (חָבֵא); Hosea 5:3 (כָּחַד); Hosea 13:14; Amos 9:3; Micah 3:4; Zephaniah 2:3 (סָחַר).

<sup>11</sup>Hosea 5:14f. (חָלַךְ); Habakkuk 3:6 (חֲלִיכָה).

<sup>12</sup>Hosea 6:4(3); 10:12; Habakkuk 3:3; Zechariah 2:14(10); 14:5; Malachi 3:1; 4:5(3:24) (בֹּא).

<sup>13</sup>Micah 1:3; Habakkuk 3:13; Zechariah 14:3 (יָצָא); Hosea 6:3 (מִוְצָא).

<sup>14</sup>Micah 1:3 (יָרַד).

near<sup>1</sup>, passing over<sup>2</sup>, marching<sup>3</sup>, treading<sup>4</sup>, removing<sup>5</sup>,  
returning<sup>6</sup>, rising<sup>7</sup>, arousing<sup>8</sup>, taking<sup>9</sup>, bringing down<sup>10</sup>, bring-  
ing up<sup>11</sup>, withdrawing<sup>12</sup>, departing<sup>13</sup>, and the like.

The above group of anthropomorphic<sup>14</sup> descriptive terms

---

<sup>1</sup>Malachi 3:5 (קרב).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 10:11; Amos 5:17; 7:8; 8:2; Micah 7:18 (עבר).

<sup>3</sup>Habakkuk 3:12 (צעד).

<sup>4</sup>Micah 1:3 (דרך).

<sup>5</sup>Zechariah 3:9 (מוש).

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 2:11(9); 5:15; 6:12(11); Joel 2:14; 4(3):1;  
Amos 9:14; Jonah 3:9; Micah 7:19; Nahum 2:3(2); Zephaniah  
2:7; 3:20; Zechariah 1:3,16; 8:3; Malachi 3:7 (שוב).

<sup>7</sup>Amos 7:9; Zephaniah 3:8 (קים); cf. Hosea 6:2; Amos  
2:11; 5:2; 6:15(14); 9:11; Habakkuk 1:6; Zechariah 11:16  
(קים, hiphil = "to raise").

<sup>8</sup>Zechariah 2:17(13) (עור - niphil); cf. Zechariah  
9:13 (pol.); Joel 4(3):7; Haggai 1:14 (niphil).

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 2:11(9); Amos 7:15; 9:3; Jonah 4:3; Haggai  
2:23 (24 - לקח); cf. Zechariah 11:7,10,13 (לקח).

<sup>10</sup>Hosea 7:12; Joel 2:23; 4(3):2; Amos 9:2; Obadiah 4  
(ירר - hiphil); Joel 4(3):11 (נחה - hiphil).

<sup>11</sup>Hosea 12:14(13); Amos 2:10; 3:1; 8:10; 9:7; Jonah  
2:7(6); Micah 6:4 (עלה - hiphil).

<sup>12</sup>Hosea 5:6 (חלץ).

<sup>13</sup>Hosea 9:12 (שור).

<sup>14</sup>The term, "anti-anthropomorphic", is used here in the  
broader sense which includes both (1) strict or technical  
sense, i.e., the avoidance of the attributing of human form  
to God, and (2) the wider sense, i.e., the removal or  
moderation of anything "... connected with God which might  
lower his dignity, or degrade his honor or character."  
(Fritsch, Charles T., The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek  
Pentateuch [Princeton: Princeton University Press], 1943,  
p. 3).

which have been applied to Deity is not complete or all inclusive, but is typical of all such stated or implied attributes of Deity. As such they constitute the group of words which have been examined in this thesis.



SECTION I.

THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHIC TENDENCIES OF THE  
MASORETIC TEXT OF THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS



## CHAPTER I

### THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHIC TENDENCIES OF THE MASORETIC TEXT

Rather early in Judaism there arose a group of people who objected to the crude anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms of the Hebrew Scriptures. Perhaps the corporality of the deities of the surrounding regions, their needs and passions, together with their inadequate knowledge, power, and justice, gradually began to impress unfavorably the more pious, thoughtful, and zealous members of the Jewish community.

This unfavorable impression may have been deepened, as Marmorstein<sup>1</sup> suggests, by contact with the heathen world, especially with the Greeks who ridiculed gods who had human passions, faults, and forms. More likely, the growing realization of the essentially holy and righteous nature of Deity contributed more than other causes to the desire to "safeguard" the concept of Deity from the cruder anthropomorphic phrases. This probability is increased by the fact that long before the post-Biblical period and the time of the Greek and Aramaic translations, prophets arose within Judaism who protested against attributing human emotions to God and parts (or the whole) of the human body. The objec-

---

<sup>1</sup>Marmorstein, A.: The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God II, Essays in Anthropomorphism, Jews' College Publication, No. 14 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937), pp. 1-4, especially p. 3.

tion to the anthropomorphic description of God is at least as old as the second commandment (Exodus 20:4) in the E<sup>1</sup> document<sup>2</sup> written in the seventh or eighth century<sup>3</sup>. This same anti-anthropomorphic tendency is seen in the denial that God is a man (Hosea 13:4<sup>4</sup>; cf. Numbers 23:19 JE<sup>5</sup>) and in the be-

---

<sup>1</sup>Driver, S.R., An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1913) 9th edition revised, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup>The discussion of the documentary treatment of the Pentateuch is beyond the scope of this work. The terminology adopted for the sake of convenience in this chapter does not reflect necessarily this author's position and viewpoint in every detail or even on every major point.

<sup>3</sup>Driver (op. cit., p. 125) considered both J and E to date from the early monarchial period. Today, however, the problem is not so simple; "... the history of any one of the 'documents' may well be as complicated as the history of the whole Pentateuch was conceived ..." in the time of S. R. Driver (or even later). "We can no longer use the figure of a single date-line, but must think rather of a dimensional area ... on the whole, we must be less confident of our datings than was once customary." (Rowley, H. H. editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951], pp. 81f. C. R. North's chapter on "Pentateuchal Criticism", pp. 48-63).

<sup>4</sup>In connection with this statement, the following should be considered: "Wenn die Erwähnung der Körperteile Jahwes als Anthropomorphismen zu verstehen wären, hätten wir erwarten sollen, dass in der ältesten und primitivsten Zeit die Anthropomorphismen sich häufen sollten, um später mehr und mehr abzunehmen. Das Entgegengesetzte ist der Fall. Das vielleicht älteste Lied im Alten Testament, . . . , f schildert anfangs Jahwes Zorn und Gewalt über die Naturkräfte . . . ohne irgendeinen Körperteil zu nennen. So sind auch die Propheten Amos und Hosea viel sparsamer und nüchterner in der Beschreibung Jahwes als Deutero-Jesaja." (Boyman, T., Das hebräische Denken im Vergleich mit dem Griechischen [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952], p. 85). This book was received too late to be used by this investigator, but it contains much valuable material.

<sup>5</sup>Driver, op. cit., p. 67.

lief that no one could see God and live (Exodus 33:20 J<sup>1</sup>).

## 1. THE USE OF INTERMEDIARIES

Another way of expressing this anti-anthropomorphic tendency was through development of the idea that intermediaries were active between God and man. Through these intermediaries not only the conception of God was safeguarded from the idea that He had a visible form<sup>2</sup>, but also through them He became more transcendent and less immanent<sup>3</sup>. This "spiritualization of the Theophany"<sup>4</sup> by the use of the intermediaries, the Angel of Yahweh<sup>5</sup>, the Glory of Yahweh, the Presence of Yahweh, and the Name of Yahweh, was established gradually and obtained its greatest Biblical emphasis in some of the later books.

These intermediaries, especially the Angel of Yahweh,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Deuteronomy 4:15.

<sup>3</sup>The use of intermediaries arose from the strong belief in the transcendence of God.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Eichrodt, Walther, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1939), II, pp. 5-18.

<sup>5</sup>Many scholars would not classify the Angel of Yahweh as an intermediary, e.g., "These intermediary beings should not, however, be confused with 'the angel of Yahweh' to which repeated reference is made in the earlier part of the Old Testament. It is generally agreed that the mal'ak Yahweh was no angelic intermediary but a divine theophany, a manifestation of Yahweh Himself." (Rust, E.C., Nature and Man in Biblical Thought (Lutterworth Library, Vol. XL, London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 125).



originally were not anti-anthropomorphic, nor did they particularly spiritualize Deity. Rather, the Angel of Yahweh originally was a form of the appearance of Yahweh Himself which did not exhaust Yahweh's full being. The sudden changes of the Angel of Yahweh to the simple Yahweh are illustrative of its purpose. "The designation 'angel of Jahweh' is necessary wherever he comes (particularly in conversation) into direct contact with men, whereas the simple 'Jahweh' is sufficient when God is to be thought of as if by Himself, separate from men or at least unseen by them."<sup>1</sup> This concept was spiritualized as it occurred in J, E, and so on. As the concept of God grew deeper, the Angel of Yahweh was used in sharper contrast to Yahweh Himself until the distinction between the Angel of Yahweh, as a manifestation of Yahweh, and a created angel was obscured. In the pre-exilic prophets, the Angel of Yahweh, as an appearance of Yahweh, disappeared only to reappear in Zechariah where he was clearly a creature<sup>2</sup> and was separate from Yahweh Himself.

The Presence of Yahweh is related closely to the original meaning of the Angel of Yahweh. Likewise, this expression of Yahweh's manifestation does not exhaust His full

---

<sup>1</sup>Kautzsch, E., "Religion of Israel", Hastings, J., editor, A Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1904), Extra Volume, p. 638.

<sup>2</sup>According to Kautzsch (ibid., p. 639).

being<sup>1</sup> but constitutes another step in the spiritualization of Deity and away from the anthropomorphic description of God. Once (in Micah 3:4<sup>2</sup>) the expression (the Presence of Yahweh) is used, apparently, as the equivalent of an anthropopatism<sup>3</sup>, namely, ". . . a graphic picture of [God's] aversion or displeasure;"<sup>4</sup>. Similarly, the idea of conciliating God or obtaining His favor is conveyed by the expression, "to make God's face sweet"<sup>5</sup>, four times<sup>6</sup> in the "Twelve"<sup>7</sup>. In the majority of instances the Presence of Yahweh is simply an emphatic way of expressing the personal pronoun<sup>8</sup>, i.e., it is a form of denoting God's manifestation,

---

<sup>1</sup>Kautzsch, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup>וַיִּסְתֵּר פָּנָיו מֵהֶם ("And He will hide His Face [Presence] from them").

<sup>3</sup>The Targum considered this verse to limit God to a given place and not as an anthropopatism (see page 234). Perhaps the Septuagint regarded it in the same way since it translated פָּנָיו by ἀποστρέφω but rendered יְיָ literally (see pages 128f.).

<sup>4</sup>Johnson, A.R., "Aspects of the Use of The Term פָּנָיו in the Old Testament", Fück, J., editor, Festschrift Otto Eissfeldt, (Halle an der Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1947), p. 156.

<sup>5</sup>Johnson, op. cit., p. 156; e.g., Zechariah 7:2 (וַיִּסְתֵּר פָּנָיו מֵהֶם).

<sup>6</sup>Zechariah 7:2; 8:21,22; Malachi 1:9.

<sup>7</sup>Hereafter "the Twelve" will be used without quotation marks for the Minor Prophets (or the Book of the Twelve Prophets).

<sup>8</sup>Johnson, op. cit., p. 158.

e.g., to seek God<sup>1</sup>, to live along side of God<sup>2</sup>, to be with God<sup>3</sup>, etc. Probably, in the case of prepositional phrases (לפני<sup>4</sup>, נגד פ<sup>5</sup>, סלפני<sup>6</sup>, and ספני<sup>7</sup>) the original meaning of the Hebrew scarcely was felt by the Hebrew authors<sup>8</sup>. This conclusion is confirmed by the treatment of these expressions by the Septuagint. Even with regard to these prepositional phrases, it is possible that in certain instances<sup>9</sup> they represent a form of the Presence of Yahweh, e.g., to come before Him<sup>10</sup>. This is less certain with regard to the idea of being silent<sup>11</sup> or fearing (worshipping)<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 5:15 (וּבִקֵּשׁ וּפָנִי -- "and seek My Face").

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 6:2 (וְנִחִיָּה לִפְנֵי יְיָ -- "that we may live in His Presence").

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 7:2 (נִגַּד פְּנֵי הָיוּ -- "they are before Me").

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 6:2; Habakkuk 3:5; Malachi 3:16 (לִפְנֵי יְיָ); Jonah 1:2; Haggai 2:14 (לִפְנֵי יְיָ).

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 7:2.

<sup>6</sup>Jonah 1:3 (twice), 10.

<sup>7</sup>Nahum 1:5 and Habakkuk 2:20 (סִפְּנֵי יְיָ); Haggai 1:12; Zephaniah 1:7; Zechariah 2:13(17); and Malachi 3:14 (סִפְּנֵי יְיָ).

<sup>8</sup>Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 157; cf. Malachi 3:14 (סִפְּנֵי יְיָ -- "Because of (before) Yahweh of Hosts").

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 6:2 (וְנִחִיָּה לִפְנֵי יְיָ -- "that we may live in His Presence"); Hosea 7:2 (נִגַּד פְּנֵי הָיוּ -- "they are before Me").

<sup>10</sup>Jonah 1:2 (כִּי - עָלְתָה רָעָתָם לִפְנֵי יְיָ -- "Because their wickedness has come up into My Presence").

<sup>11</sup>Habakkuk 2:20 (הִם סִפְּנֵי יְיָ); cf. Zephaniah 1:7; Zechariah 2:13(17).

<sup>12</sup>Haggai 1:12 (וַיִּירָאוּ הָעָם סִפְּנֵי יְיָ).

before God. In Jonah 1:3 (twice), 10, and Haggai 2:14 it is unlikely that the actual manifestation is meant other than in the "vague, spiritual" sense that Yahweh was omnipresent in Palestine, etc. Nahum 1:5 is uncertain, but, in Habakkuk 3:5 and Malachi 3:16, the prepositional phrase certainly has reference to a form of the manifestation of Yahweh.

The Glory (כבוד) of Yahweh is another intermediary which occurs in the Twelve. It is used in the material or human sense in Haggai 2:7 and Malachi 1:6. The Glory is used as a term which denotes the character and being of God as He has revealed Himself. Not only in the pre-exilic prophets does it denote this form of manifestation, but also it especially denotes the brilliance which glows forth giving evidence of His presence<sup>1</sup>. Perhaps this is the meaning of Glory in Hosea 4:7<sup>2</sup> where God says that the Israelites have changed His glory into shame. This is the meaning in Habakkuk 2:14<sup>3</sup> where it has been widened to include also "... the manifestations of the Divine majesty and omnipotence which are displayed ..."<sup>4</sup> in all the universe<sup>5</sup>. After the

---

<sup>1</sup>So Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 639.

<sup>2</sup>See page 13.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Isaiah 6:3.

<sup>4</sup>Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 640.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Procksch, O., Jesaia I Kommentar zum alten Testament (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Schöll, 1930), Band IX, p. 55. On Isaiah 6:3, "In כבוד . . . ist die Majestät ausgedrückt, die als Macht, Übermacht,



exile the 'Glory of Yahweh' was used in a spiritual sense and was not pictured in human form, e.g., Zechariah 2:9(5)<sup>1</sup>.

In Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah<sup>2</sup>, and the Priestly Code<sup>3</sup> the Glory of Yahweh has been developed until it has become the form by which God becomes visible<sup>4</sup>; it is "... not simply the temporarily assumed veiling of His real being."<sup>5</sup> This may be the use in Zechariah 2:5(9) where God promises to protect Israel as a wall of fire and to be the glory in her midst. Certainly, the prophet here is speaking metaphorically, although the glory and fire are associated close-

---

Allmacht in der Schöpfung angeschaut wird. . . . Gottes 'Herrlichkeit' wird in der Fülle des Weltalls angeschaut, durchleuchtet sie wie ein Transparent. . . . doch ist bei Jesaja das Unaussprechbare, Überirdische, Übersinnliche viel geistiger als bei Hesekiel dargestellt." Morgenstern states that Isaiah, as also J and P, conceives of Yahweh as a Being of Light (cf. Micah 7:8) -- at least in His relationship with mankind. In Isaiah (as also in J) Yahweh is characterized by the Glory "... upon which no mortal can look and live." (Morgenstern, I, "Biblical Theophanies", Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, XXVIII (1913), pp. 38f.)

<sup>1</sup>So Morgenstern, ibid., pp. 45f.

<sup>2</sup>Isaiah 40 - 66.

<sup>3</sup>The Glory here is closely associated with the Shekinah of later Judaism (Gray, G.B., "Glory (in O.T.)", Hastings, J., editor, A Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1905), II, p. 185.

<sup>4</sup>Scholars are not agreed as to the priority in time of the use of the Glory of God to designate the physical phenomenon denoting the presence of Yahweh and to designate His revealed Being and character (Ramsey, A. M., The Glory of God and The Transfiguration of Christ (London: Longmans, Greens, and Co., 1949), p. 10.).

<sup>5</sup>Kautzsch, loc. cit.

ly in the latest development of this intermediary-concept<sup>1</sup>.

Thus, the three intermediaries are progressive steps in the attempt to avoid the anthropomorphic concept that Yahweh had a physical (human) form. The Presence of Yahweh and the Glory of Yahweh represent a considerable advance over the earlier concept of the Angel of Yahweh. In the Presence of Yahweh and in the Glory of Yahweh the thought of a human form is relegated to the background as much as possible<sup>2</sup>. The Name of Yahweh, however, constitutes a still further step by which all introduction of a bodily form is avoided. This concept is difficult for one to realize fully today. A name, to ancient man, meant "a something parallel to the man, relatively independent of its bearer, but of great importance for his weal or his woe, a something which at once describes and influences its bearer."<sup>3</sup> Because of this, in heathen cults the name of the deity was kept secret -- or at least its pronunciation -- to prevent the invocation by an improper party<sup>4</sup>. A trace of this may be

---

<sup>1</sup>Loc. cit.; cf. Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 185. Cf. Exodus 24:16f; Leviticus 9:23f; Numbers 14:10; 16:19; 20:6,8.

<sup>2</sup>Kautzsch, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup>Loc. cit. Kautzsch here cites and translates Giesebrecht, Friedrich, *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage*, (Königsberg: Verlag von Thomas und Oppermann, 1901), p. 94. Cf. "Demnach ist der Name ein von seinem Träger relativ unabhängiges, aber für sein Wohl und Wehe höchst wichtiges Parallelwesen zum Menschen, das seinen Träger zugleich darstellt und beeinflusst." (*loc. cit.*).

<sup>4</sup>Kautzsch, *loc. cit.*

seen in Amos 6:10<sup>1</sup>. Although in Judaism the magical and superstitious use of "name" in connection with Deity is not entirely lacking<sup>2</sup>, the Name of Yahweh, in many passages in the Twelve, apparently is identical with the person of Yahweh, e.g., Joel 2:26 (praise); Joel 2:32(3:5), Zephaniah 3:9, and Zechariah 13:9 (call upon); Amos 2:7 (profane); Micah 6:9? (see); Zephaniah 3:12 (take refuge in); Zechariah 13:3 (speak lies in); Malachi 1:6 (despise); Malachi 1:11 (offer to); Malachi 1:14, and 2:5 (fear); perhaps Malachi 1:11 (be great); and Micah 4:5 and Zechariah 10:12 (walk in).

Although this spiritualization of the Theophany took place gradually and progressively until the Name of Yahweh, in place of the person of Yahweh, eliminated completely the physical form of Deity, and although E was less anthropomorphic than J, and P less anthropomorphic than either E or J<sup>3</sup>, nevertheless, paradoxically<sup>4</sup>, the most unrestricted use of

---

<sup>1</sup>Kautzsch (*loc. cit.*) states this more emphatically. "Amos 6<sup>10</sup> is best explained . . . as expressing a dread of provoking the fiercely enraged Deity still further by uttering His name (cf. also 8<sup>3</sup>)."

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Genesis 32:30; Judges 9:20,57; 13:18; 17:1ff; 2 Kings 2:24; *et al.*

<sup>3</sup>Fritsch, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup>Perhaps this paradox is reflected in the Greek translation (Septuagint) in the retention and even addition of anthropomorphic language (e.g., Hosea 9:12; 11:3; *et al.* [see Chapter V], where the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text).

anthropomorphic language occurred in those passages which stressed most noticeably the transcendence of God, and which spiritualized, to the greatest extent, the concept of Deity. Even those works which lie outside the scope of this investigation, although jealously guarding the transcendence of God, nevertheless, employ anthropomorphisms. Moreover, it is not to be expected that the trend towards anti-anthropomorphic language and the spiritualization of Deity always should have developed uniformly in a straight line. This lack of uniform development may have been due partially to a conflict between two or more groups of Jews -- the Literalist, the Spiritualist, etc. -- as well as to the incapability of man to express his relationship to God in a satisfactory way without the use of some anthropomorphisms. After all, man is unable to ". . . worship or show reverence to an impersonal power . . ." <sup>1</sup> which is ". . . nameless and impotent, without attributes of goodness or justice, not visible by deeds and unrecognizable by passions," <sup>2</sup> -- no matter how much modern man may try. Hence, the dual concepts of a transcendent, Holy God and that of an immanent, personal Deity developed parallel to each other and are to be found in every portion of the Old Testament.

---

<sup>1</sup>Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit.



2. THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHISMS OF THE SOPHERIM<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps this stage in the history of our current Masoretic Text was the most crucial and important one. Ginsburg<sup>2</sup> treated the emendations made by the Sopherim<sup>3</sup> which removed the "Indelicate Expressions, Anthropomorphisms

---

<sup>1</sup>Whether the Sopherim emended the Hebrew text or not has been a matter of controversy. [W. E. Barnes, for example, opposes the more generally accepted view. See his article, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament (Tikkun Sopherim)", in The Journal of Theological Studies, 1(1900): 387-414.] The Tannaitic writings, when citing certain verses, elsewhere described as corrections of the Sopherim, state that the Scriptures (שְׂכִינָה הַכְּתוּב) used euphemistic expressions. Probably these passages which the Sopherim are said to have altered were changed either by them or some other scribal school. The principle for such emendations is stated clearly in the Babylonian Talmud (Yebamoth 79a) which reads, "R. Hiyya b. Abba reported in the name of R. Johanan: It is better that one letter be removed [uprooted] from the Torah than that the Divine name be publicly profaned. . . . R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak: It is preferable to have one letter removed from the Torah so that the Divine name may be publicly hallowed." [Translation of the Talmud is from Liberman, Saul, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), chapter entitled, "Corrections of the Soferim", pp. 28-37, especially p. 35.] This translation emphasizes that the Sopherim altered only passages which concerned the honor of Deity -- in fact, in certain instances the expressions which they changed are almost blasphemous. On the other hand, the Sopherim were not consistent -- they did not make alterations in every appropriate place.

<sup>2</sup>Ginsburg, C.D., Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible (London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897), pp. 345-363.

<sup>3</sup>That the Sopherim were not merely copyists but were also revisers of the Text is recognized more generally today; cf. also Robertson, Ewald, "Points of Interest in the Masoretic Text", The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 2(1943): 35-39, etc.

etc. from the Text"<sup>1</sup> as if there was little doubt as to the reason for such changes. He collated from the Masorah lists some eighteen such emendations, four of which occurred in the Twelve. To this a fifth one has been added from Kittel's Biblia Hebraica, third edition.

(1) In Hosea 4:7 the clause, כבודם בקלון אמיר<sup>2</sup> ("I will change their glory into shame"<sup>3</sup>), occurs. Originally, according to the Masorah lists, כבודי<sup>4</sup> ("My glory") was read. As Ginsburg<sup>5</sup> observed, however, this reading would require also an alteration of the verb from the first person to the third<sup>6</sup>. Thus the text originally read:

המירו [המיר] בקלון כבודי<sup>7</sup> ("My Glory they have changed to shame"). This was altered either because it was inconceivable that anyone could change God's glory to shame or else because it was considered to be too

<sup>1</sup>Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 345.

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint support the Masoretic Text.

<sup>3</sup>The Holy Bible Revised Standard Version (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952) is used generally for the translation of the Hebrew text for the "longer" quotations. This procedure is not carried out so consistently in the footnotes.

<sup>4</sup>A change of final ם and י.

<sup>5</sup>Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 357.

<sup>6</sup>The Targum and the Syriac support a third person plural original reading; cf. Procksch, O., "Liber XII Prophetarum", Kittel, R., editor, Biblia Hebraica, third edition (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1949), footnote, p. 898.

<sup>7</sup>This is the only example in the Twelve.

offensive, or for both reasons. The original reading fits the context better.

(2) A portion of Habakkuk 1:12<sup>1</sup> reads הלוֹא אַתָּה מִקֶּדֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי קֹדֶשׁ לֹא נִמְוֹת ("Art thou not from everlasting, O Lord my <sup>holy god</sup> God, my Holy One? We shall not die,"). According to the Masorah lists<sup>3</sup>, this should have read: הלוֹא אַתָּה מִקֶּדֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי קֹדֶשׁ לֹא נִמְוֹת<sup>4</sup> ("Are You not from everlasting, O Yahweh, my Holy One? You die not,"). Obviously the context favors the last reading, but this reading has been altered because it contained the offensive, negative implication that it was possible that God could die. The Targum retained the original idea by the anti-anthropomorphic paraphrase: "Your word endures forever".

(3) In Zechariah 2:12(8)<sup>5</sup> כִּי הִנֵּנִי בְּכַף נֹנֵץ<sup>6</sup> בְּכַף עֵינִי ("Because he who touches you touches the apple of his eye,") is found. The original text was altered

---

<sup>1</sup>Only appropriate instance in the Twelve.

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint supports the Masoretic Text.

<sup>3</sup>Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 358; Procksch, op. cit., p. 947, footnote.

<sup>4</sup>A change of ׀ and ׀.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Lieberman, op. cit., p. 28.

<sup>6</sup>The Septuagint and Targum support the Masoretic Text.

by the Sopherim<sup>1</sup> to avoid the anthropomorphic description of Deity in a statement made by God: כִּי הִנֵנִי נֹכַח עֵינַי ("Because he who touches you, touches the apple of My eye<sup>3</sup>.").

(4) The original of Malachi 1:13 contained a statement which was regarded as being too derogatory of God. Therefore, the Sopherim<sup>4</sup> altered the text from וְהִפַּחְתֶּם אֹזְנוֹתַי ("And you sniff at me,<sup>5</sup>" -- preserved in several manuscripts) to וְהִפַּחְתֶּם אֹזְנוֹתָיו ("And you sniff at it,<sup>7</sup>").

(5) In Malachi 1:12 וְאַתֶּם כֹּהֲלֵי יְהוָה<sup>8</sup> ("But you profane it . . . , " i.e., God's Name) occurs. This passage<sup>9</sup> read originally וְאַתֶּם כֹּהֲלֵי יְהוָה<sup>10</sup> ("But

<sup>1</sup>Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 359; Procksch, op. cit., p. 960, footnote.

<sup>2</sup>A change of י and ך'.

<sup>3</sup>W Tert. III 539 = Vulg. These support the Sopherim; cf. Iust., 534.

<sup>4</sup>Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 359f.

<sup>5</sup>Only appropriate instance in the Twelve of snuffing at God. This translation follows the Revised Standard Version, p. 995.

<sup>6</sup>A change of י and ך'. The Septuagint and Targum support the Masoretic Text.

<sup>7</sup>Revised Standard Version, footnote d, p. 995.

<sup>8</sup>The Septuagint and Targum support the Masoretic Text.

<sup>9</sup>Procksch, op. cit., p. 973, footnote.

<sup>10</sup>A change of י and ך'.



you profane Me.")<sup>1</sup>. Apparently, it was considered too derogatory for God to say that anyone profaned Him; thus it was softened to the idea of profanation of His Name<sup>2</sup>.

These last three examples are of particular interest since the emendation involves only the interchange of yodh ( י ) and a waw ( ו ).

The protection<sup>3</sup> of the Tetragrammaton and other

---

<sup>1</sup>The statement that God is profaned ( ללח ) may occur also in Zephaniah 3:4 and Malachi 2:11. In these two passages the context permits the reference to be interpreted as applying to the cult objects -- in fact, the Septuagint makes this interpretation in both instances:

(1) Zephaniah 3:4

כהניח לללח-קדש

her priests have profaned  
what is sacred [the Holy  
One],

οι ιερεις αυτης βεβηλουσι  
τα αγια

her priests profane the  
holies

(2) Malachi 2:11

כי לללח יהודה קדש  
יהוה אשר אהב

for Judah has profaned  
the sanctuary of the Lord  
[the Holy One, Yahweh],  
which he loves,

διοτι εβεβηλωσεν Ιουδας  
τα αγια κυριου εν ος  
ηγαπησε

because Judah profaned  
the holy things of the  
Lord in which he de-  
lighted.

<sup>2</sup>In Amos 2:7 God's Name is said to be profaned, e.g., 'שדק שם-אלה ללח יעל ("... so that my holy name is profaned;"). Perhaps this text may have suggested the alteration in Malachi 1:12 to the Sopherim.

<sup>3</sup>Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 367-399.

Divine names shows a similar tendency. Thus within the Hebrew Text itself are found two forms of certain names which are compounded with Deity, although in certain cases one form has been standardized throughout the Old Testament.

The Tetragrammaton has been compounded as a prefix in two forms: (1) a longer one יהו' and (2) a shorter one י'. Examples of the former are: יהו'צדק<sup>1</sup> and יהושפט<sup>2</sup>, and of the latter: יואש<sup>3</sup>. An instance of the complete eradication of the longer form is יותם<sup>4</sup>.

The one hundred forty-one proper names which involve the Tetragrammaton as a suffix have been treated in like manner. Examples of the shorter form (יה') are: אליה<sup>5</sup>, יחזקיה<sup>11</sup>, חזקיה<sup>10</sup>, זכריה<sup>9</sup>, גדליה<sup>8</sup>, אמריה<sup>7</sup>, אמציה<sup>6</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Haggai 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4; Zechariah 6:11.

<sup>2</sup>Joel 4:2,12.

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 1:1; Amos 1:1; cf. the Septuagint.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 1:1; Micah 1:1.

<sup>5</sup>Malachi 3:23.

<sup>6</sup>Amos 7:10,12,14.

<sup>7</sup>Zephaniah 1:1.

<sup>8</sup>Zephaniah 1:1.

<sup>9</sup>Zechariah 1:1,7; 7:1,8.

<sup>10</sup>Zephaniah 1:1.

<sup>11</sup>Hosea 1:1; Micah 1:1.

מִנְיָה <sup>1</sup>, עֲזִיָּה <sup>2</sup>, צַפְנִיָּה <sup>3</sup>, and of the longer form: יֵאֵשִׁיחוּ <sup>4</sup>.

The term בֵּית אֶרְבָּאל ("Betharbel") in Hosea 10:14 most likely disguises an original pointing of בֵּית אֶרְבָּאֵל ("The house of the ambush of God,"). This was altered to its present form because it was considered to be offensive "to ascribe to God the laying of an ambush,"<sup>5</sup> i.e., it was too offensive an anthropomorphism.

### 3. THE EDITORIAL ALTERATIONS

In addition to the changes which were introduced into the Hebrew Text by the Sopherim, most scholars agree that the various early editors of the Book of the Twelve, who were responsible for the combination of the Twelve into a single unit and for its subsequent transmission, introduced other alterations into the Hebrew Text. Oort, Marti, Duhm, Budde, Pfeiffer, Cheyne, Arnold, Volz, Haupt, Welch, -- just to mention a few -- have all contributed to the investigation of these editorial changes. One of the best

---

<sup>1</sup>Zechariah 6:10,14.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 1:1; Amos 1:1; Zechariah 14:5.

<sup>3</sup>Zephaniah 1:1; Zechariah 6:10,14.

<sup>4</sup>Zephaniah 1:1.

<sup>5</sup>Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 397; cf. the Septuagint οἴκου του Ἱερουσαλὴμ corresponding to a Hebrew בֵּית יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, according to Ginsburg.

summaries of the contributions made by the investigators in this field up to 1934 is the article by Dr. Rolland Emerson Wolfe<sup>1</sup>. He considers that there were some thirteen editors or editorial schools<sup>2</sup>, and his classification and summary of these different editorial schools, whether they existed or not as he views them, are of considerable interest in view of the alterations which are found in the Septuagint and Targum.

(1) "THE JUDAISTIC EDITOR OF HOSEA"<sup>3</sup>

This editor, in order to make this prophecy more forceful to the Jewish reader, made certain alterations:

(1) the substitution of יהודה ("Judah") for an original ישראל<sup>4</sup> ("Israel"), (2) certain additions which included the name יהודה<sup>5</sup> ("Judah"), and, (3) a group of interpolations in which יהודה ("Judah") did not occur. Thus, the

---

<sup>1</sup>Wolfe, Rolland Emerson, "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Bd. 12(1935), pp. 90-129.

<sup>2</sup>This number is not exact. It is not inconceivable that the same editor (or editorial school) introduced more than one kind of alteration into the Text. See footnote 2, page 2.

<sup>3</sup>The classification followed is that of Wolfe, and the comments under each editor or editorial school substantially summarize the views of Wolfe.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 5:10,12,13,14; 6:4; 10:11 (Wolfe, op. cit., p. 91).

<sup>5</sup>5:5c from לַשָּׁן; 6:11a to לַיָּד; 8:14; 12:1b from וַיְהוּדָה; 12:3 (loc. cit.).

editor emphasized the vile character of the religious apostasy of Israel as a severe warning to the reader in Jerusalem and Judea<sup>1</sup>. He revealed the fact that Israel was already in exile to warn Judah who was following in the footsteps of Israel<sup>2</sup>. One group of alterations apparently was addressed specifically to Judah<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, not all the references to Judah are due to this editor. Those found in Chapters I - III were inserted by later hands.

## (2) "THE ANTI-HIGH PLACE EDITOR"

This editor made certain insertions in order to harmonize the prophecies with the Deuteronomic movement<sup>4</sup>. Thus, he denounced the shrines in Israel and the multiplicity of altars in general. He condemned the shrines as such (Hosea and Amos did so because of the abominations). Moreover, "it is evident, from Hosea 94.5, that the temple at Jerusalem is

---

<sup>1</sup>Loc. cit., Hosea 14:1b (כי מרחק באלהיה), 4:16a (to ישראל); 11:5c (last clause); 4:10c (last clause); 4:12b (from ויזנו); 6:10b (from ונות); 9:1cd (from כי); 4:18; 7:8 (last half); 13:13b (חכם to הוא); 5:3-4, 6-7.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit.; Hosea 10:15ab (to רעצכם); 9:3a (to יהוה); 13:9; 9:17; 8:8-9 (except פרא בודד לו).

<sup>3</sup>Loc. cit.; Hosea 4:1b (כי to כי); 4:9bc (from ופקדתי); 10:13b (from כי).

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 93; cf. Hosea 4:15, 19b (from ויבשן); 8:11-13a (to רצם); 9:4-5; 10:1b (from כרב) - 2, 4e (from על), 8ab (to מובחותם, except חצת ישראל which is late scribal); 12:12 (except second clause); cf. Amos 3:13-14; 5:4b (from דרשוני) - 5c (to העברו), 6, 14-15; 7:9 (ibid., p. 92).



the sole place of legitimate worship . . . In Amos 5<sup>4</sup> 'Seek Me' is equivalent to 'Worship at Jerusalem'.<sup>1</sup>

### (3) "THE LATE EXILIC EDITOR"

This editor made the additions of hope to the prophecies in five of the twelve books which otherwise contained forebodings of the deepest gloom. He made the following insertions: Micah 1:2-4; 2:12-13; 4:1-4; 5:6; Hosea 1:6c (from כִּי ) - 7a (to אֲרָחָם ); 2:1b (from וְהָיָה ) - 3; 3:1-5; 2:16-17c (to נְעֻרָיָהּ ), 19, 21-22, 25; 4:16b (from עָתָה ); 5:15-6:3; 6:11b (from בְּשׁוּבִי ) - 7:1a (to לִישׁוּעָא ); 7:13c ( וְאֲנֹכִי אֶפְסָם ); 7:15b ( יִסְרָחִי ); 8:10a (to אֶקְבֹּצֵם ); 10:12; 11:8-11; 12:7; 13:14 (to שָׁלוֹל ); 14:2-4b (to נִרְכֵּב ), 5ab (to נִדְבָה ), 6-8; Zephaniah 3:14-15b (to אֵיכָּךְ ), 16b (from אֵל ), 17 (except יִהְיֶה בְּאַחֲרֵתָם ); Amos 9:8c (from אֶפְסָם ) - 10; Nahum 1:12c (from וְעַתָּךְ ) - 13; 2:1, 3<sup>2</sup>.

This editor was familiar with Deutero-Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. He portrayed the triumphant return of the exiles, and the return of Yahweh to Jerusalem. Then an era of universal peace would come, and Yahweh would be worshipped everywhere. The heathen would make pilgrimages to Jerusalem.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 93.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit.

The redeemed Israel -- her returned exiles -- and Jerusalem would be blessed and exalted. Good-will is extended even towards the heathen.

#### (4) "THE ANTI-NEIGHBOR EDITOR"

This editor made the alterations<sup>1</sup> expressing the great anger which Yahweh would exert against the heathen. His alterations also indicated zeal for a Zion<sup>2</sup> which would be victorious over the heathen<sup>3</sup>. His anger was directed principally against Edom and the Mediterranean Coastal area, e.g., Tyre and Sidon, but he also included Moab, Ammon, and Damascus<sup>4</sup>. The remnant of the nation of Judah<sup>5</sup> he called to wage war, and, if they did so, then Yahweh with His heavenly host would come to their rescue. With His assistance, the heathen neighbors would be destroyed<sup>6</sup>, and the Jews then would dwell securely. Finally, all the exiles would be able to return.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 96f.

<sup>2</sup>Zechariah 1:15; 2:13; Haggai 2:7f; Isaiah 49:22ff; 60:5-16; 62:11f; 61:4-6.

<sup>3</sup>Zechariah 2:3,4; 6:1-8; Ezekiel 21:33-37; Isaiah 61:5f.

<sup>4</sup>His additions are: Amos 1:6-12; Joel 4:4-11,13; Zephaniah 2:4-9; Zechariah 9:1 (to "Ammon"), 2-8.

<sup>5</sup>Wolfe, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>6</sup>Only, apparently, when the neighboring nations were destroyed would it be possible for perpetual peace to come to pass (loc. cit.).

## (5) "THE MESSIANIST"

He made three additions<sup>1</sup>. These included the peaceful conquest of the heathen neighbors by the Messiah, the gradual destruction of all weapons of warfare, the peaceful and universal reign of the Messiah, and the return of the exiles at the dawn of the age. The Messiah was to be a Judean.

(6) "THE NATIONALISTIC SCHOOL OF EDITORS"<sup>2</sup>

One very early addition was made by a rabid anti-Persian<sup>3</sup>. Another such addition was made in the prophecy of Zechariah<sup>4</sup>, following the shepherd motif of the addition found in Micah. Another addition attacked Greece<sup>5</sup>, and others attacked Egypt and Assyria<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Zechariah 9:9f; Micah 5:1,2b (from מִיָּדָה) - 3; and 7:11f. These are of equal length and have similar poetic structure (*ibid.*, p. 98).

<sup>2</sup>This arose from a belief that the heathen nations had exceeded their function as the instruments of Divine punishment, e.g., Habakkuk 1:11,12b,17; 2:6ff; Zechariah 1:15; cf. Isaiah 10:5-15; 40:2b (*ibid.*, p. 99).

<sup>3</sup>Three groups: (1) Micah 4:9-13; (2) Micah 4:14; 5:4f; (3) Micah 5:7f,14 (*ibid.*, p. 100).

<sup>4</sup>Zechariah 11:1-3,17; 13:7 "was probably originally a single poem". In contrast the prose fragment in Zechariah 11:4-16 shows the greatest development of the theme of the shepherd (*ibid.*, p. 101). The prose fragment was apparently anti-Persian.

<sup>5</sup>Zechariah 9:11-15 (*ibid.*, pp. 101f).

<sup>6</sup>Zechariah 10:3-10, 11b (from מִיָּדָה), 12; Zephaniah 2:12-15 (*ibid.*, p. 102).

(7) "THE DAY OF YAHWEH<sup>1</sup> EDITOR"

This editorial school made the descriptive additions of the cosmic phenomena which were to accompany the Day of Yahweh<sup>2</sup>. They followed Amos' theme (cf. Amos 5:18f) that the Day of Yahweh was not a joyous day but a day of calamity and destruction.

## (8) "THE ESCHATOLOGISTS"

Although this school adopted certain ideas from the Twelve, Deutero-Isaiah, and Ezekiel, they mainly followed the Day of Yahweh School and used the characteristic phrase "in that day"<sup>3</sup>.

They described a time in which there was to be complete mourning in Palestine including all the living

---

<sup>1</sup>Wolfe, reads Jahwe.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 103. Amos 4:12b (from מִיָּדָה); 5:13, 18c (from הַיּוֹם), 20; Obadiah 1:15a (to הַיּוֹם); Joel 1:15; 2:1d (from כֵּן) - 2b (to וְעַתָּה), 10-11; 3:1-5; 4:1-3, 12, 14-17; Zephaniah 1:7-8a (to יְהוָה), 14-16, 18c (from בַּיּוֹם) - 2:3; 3:8b-e (from כֵּן).

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 105. Hosea 1:5, 7bc (from וְהוֹשַׁעְתִּים); 2:18, 20, 23-24; 4:3; Joel 4:18-19, 21a (to בְּיָמָי); Amos 2:14-16; 6:9-10; 7:1-6; 8:3, 8-11c (to בְּמִצְרַיִם), 12 (except לְבָשׁ (from אֶת-יְהוָה), 13, 14d (from וְנִפְלָא); 9:1, 5cde (from וְנִפְלָא), 11-15; Obadiah 8a (to יְהוָה), 9, 16-18; Micah 2:3e (from כֵּן) - 5; 4:6-8; 5:9-11; Zephaniah 1:2c (from דָּנָה) - 3 (except וְהִכְשִׁילוּ אֶת-הָרָשָׁעִים), 9c (from בְּיָמָי), 10-12a (to הַיּוֹם); 2:11; 3:9-11b (to הַיּוֹם), 15cd (from כֵּן) - 16a (to לְיִרְשָׁלַם), 18-20; Zechariah 9:16-17; 12:2-14; 13:1-6, 8-9; 14:1-21.

creatures and even the ground itself. All the nations were to be gathered to wage war against Jerusalem. Then Yahweh would come and completely annihilate them. The remaining part of Judah would gather the heathens' wealth, and the heathen nations would be possessed by Judah. Then the exiles would return, and Yahweh from Mount Zion would rule forever. Palestine would be extremely fertile. The entire land of Judah would be especially holy ground, and Jerusalem would be the world center of worship for all nations. Annihilation by plague and famine would be reserved for those who refuse. An entirely new order would be established -- even prophecy would be a thing of the past.

#### (9) "THE DOXOLOGIST"

He pictured God as the almighty Creator, and condemned idolatry. He described idols as "lies". His additions occur only in Amos (4:13; 5:8; 9:5a,b to אֱלֹהִים, 6). They may have constituted originally a single poem<sup>1</sup>.

#### (10) "THE ANTI-IDOL POLEMIST"

This editor inserted a polemic against all idols, but especially against the golden calves of Samaria. He discussed idols, graven images, molten images, etc. He de -

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 108f.



scribed idols as nonentities<sup>1</sup>.

# (11) "THE PSALM EDITOR"

This editor inserted psalms and proverbs into the prophecies. Those insertions are: Nahum 1:2-10,12b (from אם to ועבר); Jonah 2:3-10; Micah 6:6-8; 7:1-10,13-14, 16-20 (except אל-יהוה אלהינו in verse 17); Habakkuk 1:2-4,12a (to קדשי), 13-14; 2:4-5d (to ישבע), 13b ( הנה סאת יהוה צבאות ), 14,20; 3:1-19; Amos 1:2; 9:2-3; Zephaniah 3:5; Hosea 4:11,12c ( כי to התע ), 14e (last clause); 14:10; Joel 4:20,21b (last clause)<sup>2</sup>.

# (12) "THE EARLY SCRIBES"

Traditionally these scribes have been traced back to Ezra and were interested particularly in the Pentateuch. Consequently, the material of the Pentateuch influenced all of their subsequent work which might be described almost as

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 109f. Hosea 2:10e (from וזהב); 4:17, 19a (to בכנפיה); 5:11b (from כי); 8:4c (from כספם) - 5a (to שפרון), 5c (from ער) - 7a (to יפצרו); 9:10cd (from המה); 10:5-6b (to ירב), 10; 11:2,7; 12:2abc (to ירבה), 12b ( אך-שום היו ); 13:1-2; 14:4c ( ולא to ידינו ), 9; Micah 1:5ab (to ישראל ), 6-7; 5:12-13; Amos 5:5de (from כי ); 6:13; 8:14abc (to שבע ); Habakkuk 1:11b ( לאלהו to ואשם ); 2:18-19; Nahum 1:14c (from סבית to ומסכה ); Zephaniah 1:3c ( את-הרשעים ), 4d ( את-שאר העל ); Zechariah 10:1-2.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

a pentateuchal redaction<sup>1</sup>. "Or it might be called a concordance since the interpolations serve the same purpose as cross references to the books of the law and the so-called 'former prophets'."<sup>2</sup> Although they did make some general references to the Pentateuch, they usually made specific references to it. They constantly referred to the Exodus, predicted a return to Egypt, referred to the Covenant with Abraham, and the like.

### (13) "THE LATER SCRIBAL SCHOOLS"

These scribes made editorial changes which included the usual unintentional textual changes which are to be expected in the course of the transmission of any text, e.g., rearrangements, consonantal change, and the like. They also introduced changes when they separated the long lines of uninterrupted consonants into individual words. Occasionally in such separations wrong divisions were made.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 115. Hosea 2:1a (to יספר), 17d (from וכו'); 6:5ab (to פ'), 6-7; 8:1-2; 9:7c (from אויל) - 9; 10:9, 14cd (from כשר); 12:4, 5-6, 8-9, 10-11, 13-14; 13:4-6; 13:10c (from ושפטיך); Amos 1:5d (from ונלו to קירח); 2:9-12; 3:1b (from על), 7; 4:10b (מדרך מצרים); 5:3, 17, 25; 6:1d (from ובאו, to be read as imperative) - 2, 5b (כדויד), 6c (from ולא) - 7; 7:11b (from ירבעם), 17f (from ישראל); 9:4, 7bc (from second חלוא); Micah 4:5; 5:2a (to ילדה); 6:3-5, 16abc (to במעצותם); 7:15; Zechariah 10:11a (to יאור); 14:5b (יחורח גמחתם); Haggai 1:13; 2:5a (to ממצרים); Malachi 2:7; 3:22-24.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit. Could these constitute the earliest Haptaroth?

Interpretative alterations were made for purposes of clarification. Probably these changes were marginal at first and later were introduced by a copyist into the text. Moreover, as there were then no commentaries and dictionaries, some of this work was lexical and exegetical. These schools also supplied material which they felt had been omitted.

A third type of alteration was motivated by the readings in the synagogue. In this way cultic changes were introduced: e.g., (1) magnification of the vileness of idols or things reminiscent of idolatry, such as the alteration of Beth-El into Beth-Awen (house of wickedness, iniquity), and (2) the substitution of harmless words for names found in an embarrassing context, e.g.,  $\text{לַי לֵא}$  for  $\text{לַיִל}$  in Hosea 7:16 and  $\text{לַי-לֵא}$  for  $\text{לַיִל}$  in Hosea 11:7.

These editors also made the changes in the pronunciation of the Divine Name. Thus  $\text{יהוה}$  was read  $\text{יהוהי}$ , as in the synagogue.

From this discussion of editorial changes it readily is seen that certain motives were responsible for the alterations made by the various editorial schools. These motives may be classified as follows: (1) to make the prophecies more valid and emphatic for the readers; (2) cultic alter-

ations to make the text more in harmony with the current cultic and theological beliefs (These changes constituted a protection of the cult and to a certain extent of the idea of God Himself. These alterations may be seen in the denunciation of shrines, altars, the description of idols as "lies" or "nonentities", and the like.); (3) messianic and eschatological alterations; (4) pro-Israel and anti-heathen alterations; and (5) protective alterations regarding God and His Name.

#### 4. THE MASORETIC CHANGES

There is no certainty as to which changes in the Masoretic Text were introduced by the Masoretes, i.e., by the scribes who followed the Sopherim and the Editors of the Book of the Twelve. It may well be that some of the alterations which usually have been assigned to the Sopherim and the Editorial Schools (of Wolfe), really may have been changes introduced by the Masoretes. Certainly the group of changes which Wolfe<sup>1</sup> has classified as the work of the later editorial school may have been made by the Masoretes.

This group of Masoretic alterations is concerned with the protection of God's Name. In several places in Hosea (4:15; 5:8; 10:5) Bethel<sup>2</sup> originally occurred in the text.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 121. See pages 27f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. page 28.

In each such instance, Bethel occurred in a context which reflected badly on the cultus and upon God. Consequently, the substitution of בית ע"פ ("House of Iniquity") was introduced into the Hebrew Text. In the Septuagint the protective device, οἶκος ὄν<sup>1</sup> was employed. This word (ὄν) also occurred in the Septuagint of Hosea 12:5 where God (or at least His Angel) was said to be found at Bethel. Probably the translation followed the already established method in order to safeguard Jerusalem as the true center of worship and the only acceptable place to find God. Bethel occurs in the Targum of Hosea 4:15; 10:5; and 12:5. In Hosea 5:8, the Targum considerably differs from the Masoretic Text although the Hebrew Text used for the Aramaic translation probably did not differ substantially from the one possessed by the Masoretes and the translator of the Septuagint.

The Targum may retain the original text in Hosea 10:8 where, for בית ע"פ ("high places of iniquity"), it apparently translates a text reading במות ביתאל ("the high places of Bethel"). This is consistent with the translation of the Septuagint, βαυοι ὄν ("altars of On"). The reason for the alteration is obvious from the context.

Much less certain is the text of Amos 1:5 where God stated that He would break the bar of Damascus and cut off the inhabitant from Biq 'at-'awen ("the plain of iniquity").

---

<sup>1</sup>Could ὄν be a transliteration of בית ע"פ ?



This has been retained by the Targum. The translation of the Septuagint as  $\pi \epsilon \delta \iota \omicron \upsilon \ \Omega \nu$  ("plain of On") suggests that the text originally may have been  $\text{מִקְעָה-בֵּית־חַאֵל}$  ("plain of Bethel"). If the Hebrew 'Vorlage', which the Septuagint translator possessed, read  $\text{מִקְעָה-בֵּית־חַאֵל}$ , the translator may have selected this translation because of the pattern already found in Hosea 10:8. He may have been motivated by a strong pro-Israel bias and/or a strong anti-heathen bias. An alternate explanation for the translation is the suggestion that the Hebrew 'Vorlage' was  $\text{מִקְעָה-אֵל}$ , where  $\text{אֵל}$  represented one of the heathen deities. If this was the case, the translation may illustrate an instance of the protection of God's Name by the substitution of  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$ , a term which is applied frequently to heathen deities (idols).

A similar change<sup>1</sup>, the substitution of  $\text{בֹּשֶׁת}$  ("shame") for  $\text{בַּעַל}$  ("Baal"), has been made several times in the Masoretic Text. Only one fairly certain instance is found in the Twelve, namely Hosea 9:10<sup>2</sup>. The Septuagint reading of  $\alpha \iota \sigma \chi \upsilon \nu \eta$  ("shame") and the Targum's  $\text{לְבִחַח}$  ("to shame") do not support this hypothesis of an alteration in the Masoretic Text here. The remaining occurrences of  $\text{בֹּשֶׁת}$  in the Twelve have left no traces of any possible substitution in either the Aramaic or Greek Versions.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Dodd, C.H., The Bible and The Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), p. 23.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit.

X X X X X

The preceding discussion reveals clearly that even prior to the period of the Greek and Aramaic translations of the Old Testament, there existed within Judaism a veneration for Deity which affected the use of anthropomorphic language in the portrayal of God, and in other ways.

This fact is established clearly by the progressive development of thought shown in the religious ideas of the different periods as revealed by the various books of the Old Testament. Moreover, the changes in the consonantal text made by the Sopherim and the Masoretes demonstrate that the transmitters of our received text did not hesitate to alter certain passages which offended their theological beliefs. This fact supports the theory held by Wolfe and most modern scholars that there were still other editors and/or editorial schools who also, through alterations, additions, and omissions resulting from their theological bias, did not hesitate to change the text received by them. Even if the last mentioned theory is not accepted, the conclusion must be reached that certain attitudes and theological beliefs of the transmitters of the Hebrew text may be observed in our Masoretic Text.

This conclusion naturally leads to the expectation that the earliest two translations of the Hebrew text would

exhibit even more of these theological changes in their renderings. The results of this investigation of the Septuagint are found in the next section and of the Targum in the following section.

SECTION II.

THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHISMS OF THE SEPTUAGINT  
TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS



## CHAPTER II

### THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT<sup>1</sup>:

#### THE GROSSER ANTHROPOMORPHISMS

In the preceding chapter are considered the alterations made to the Hebrew text. Some of the earliest changes of the Hebrew text were introduced by the Sopherim<sup>2</sup> to eliminate statements concerning God which they considered to be the most derogatory to Deity. These changes also affected certain anthropomorphic descriptions of Deity. The motives of the Sopherim, which induced them to make these alterations, arose from their veneration of God and their theological beliefs concerning Him.

Earlier still, perhaps, the use of intermediaries<sup>3</sup> had produced the conception of God as being less immanent and more transcendent and so resulted in a reduction of the number of expressions which had described Deity in anthropomorphic language.

The various editors, scribes, et al., also introduced changes and additions to the Hebrew text because of their theological concepts.

---

<sup>1</sup>The titles and sub-titles of this dissertation, unless otherwise indicated, are limited to the Book of the Twelve Prophets.

<sup>2</sup>See pages 12ff.

<sup>3</sup>See pages 3ff.



Therefore, the early translators of the Hebrew text into Greek and into Aramaic naturally would be expected to avoid literal translations of certain passages and to employ paraphrastic translations in order to avoid statements concerning Deity which they would consider to be derogatory of God. In fact, a priori, investigators might anticipate finding more alterations in these translations than the Sopherim, the Masoretes, the scribes, editors, et al., introduced into our received Hebrew text. Consequently, it is not at all surprising that most scholars assume that the Septuagint, as well as the Targums, exhibits an anti-anthropomorphic<sup>1</sup> tendency. Examples of statements made by the investigators are:

The LXX . . . avoids completely the bold anthropomorphisms and the striking naïveté of the original text, and shows in this particular an evident relationship with the other old Bible translations of the Jews.<sup>2</sup>

A dogmatic interest has been detected in some of these paraphrastic renderings, chiefly where the LXX. have endeavoured to avoid the anthropomorphisms of the original; examples are most frequent in the Pentateuch,<sup>3</sup>

. . . both anthropomorphisms and anti-anthropomorphisms are found in the Greek Pentateuch,<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See page xxx, footnote 14.

<sup>2</sup>Buhl, F., Canon and Text of the Old Testament, J. MacPherson, translator (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1892), p. 120.

<sup>3</sup>Swete, H. B., An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1914), p. 327.

<sup>4</sup>Reider, Joseph, reviewer, "The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch, by Charles T. Fritsch. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943, pp. VII+82, \$2.00", Journal of Biblical Literature, 63 (1944), p. 204.

A prominent characteristic common to the Alexandrian and Palestinian scholars is their avoidance of anthropomorphisms and of phrases which seemed derogatory to the Deity.<sup>1</sup>

Practically all scholars agree . . . that it was primarily for reasons of anthropomorphism, anthropopathism, euphemism, denial of resurrection, etc., that the numerous acts of omission were perpetrated [in Job] . And so the fact that the LXX translator has been made responsible by practically every scholar . . . is not to be wondered at.<sup>2</sup>

. . . the Greek translators, like the Targumists, sometimes followed the interpretation current in the schools of the time, so that a different translation does not always imply a different text, more especially in prophetic passages.<sup>3</sup>

Over some expressions the LXX. avoids being literal, apparently from reverence or delicacy.<sup>4</sup>

The translators did not set out to rewrite the text of the O T, but their theology left its marks on the final product.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Thackeray, H. St. J., Some Aspects of the Greek Old Testament, (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1927), p. 37.

<sup>2</sup>Orlinsky, H. M., "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Job 14:12", The Jewish Quarterly Review, 38, (1937), p. 64.

<sup>3</sup>Neubauer, Ad., "The Introduction of the Square Characters in Biblical MSS., and an Account of the earliest MSS. of the Old Testament", Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891), p. 16.

<sup>4</sup>Ottley, R. R., A Handbook to the Septuagint (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1920), p. 131.

<sup>5</sup>Gehman, H. S., "The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1-15", Journal of Biblical Literature, 68, (1949), p. 240; cf. ". . . he [the translator] approached his task [i.e., of translating] with a definite exegetical and theological point of view." (Gehman, H. S., "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of I Samuel", Journal of the American Oriental Society, 70 (1950), p. 292.)

The translators never scruple to introduce their favourite euphemisms, or to indulge their national susceptibilities.<sup>1</sup>

The first<sup>2</sup> systematical approach to the study and classification of the anti-anthropomorphisms of any portion of the Septuagint was made by an American<sup>3</sup> in 1943. Unfortunately Fritsch does not attempt to prove that anti-anthropomorphisms existed in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. He assumes that the Septuagint in the Pentateuch had anti-anthropomorphic translations and so proceeds to classify them. Although he is conscious of certain difficulties connected with the assumption that the Septuagint avoided some anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text<sup>4</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup>Farrar, Frederic W., History of Interpretation (London: MacMillan and Co., 1886), p. 122.

<sup>2</sup>The earlier works of Fränkel, Lagarde, et al., were (and are) valuable, but, in so far as this investigator knows, the work by Fritsch is the first systematical, thorough investigation of its kind made of any portion of the Greek Old Testament. That it was not even more comprehensive is, of course, to be regretted.

<sup>3</sup>Fritsch, C. T., The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943).

<sup>4</sup>E.g., he (Fritsch, op. cit., pp. 62ff) mentions that there exist exceptions to both the anti-anthropomorphic and the anthropomorphic translations in the Septuagint. He also observes that in some passages the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew. Although he seems to be aware of these facts, apparently he does not appreciate fully their significance.

he only briefly mentions these difficulties<sup>1</sup>. This failure to investigate thoroughly the entire problem robs his otherwise very useful work of much of its value. Moreover, a few examples of anti-anthropomorphism which he cites are in reality attempts made by the translator "... to render the Hebrew into intelligible Greek."<sup>2</sup>, and other examples which he cites are more likely due to a different 'Vorlage', a misread text, or the like<sup>3</sup>.

From a perusal of Fritsch's investigation three facts emerge: (1) "... the necessity for the greatest caution [to be exercised] in stating conclusions."<sup>4</sup>; (2) the need for a re-investigation of the seeming anti-anthropomorphisms<sup>5</sup>; and finally, (3) the realization that an alteration which relieves God of some human quality, physical form or feature, or the like, is not necessarily an anti-anthropomorphism. A

---

<sup>1</sup>Fritsch, op. cit., pp. 62ff. (After Fritsch has stated that there exists at least one exception to every literal or anti-anthropomorphic translation, he continues, "The Seventy accordingly seem to have followed a definite system in these cases." -- a statement far from established!). Cf. Reider (op. cit., p. 204) who states: "Evidently the translators were not consistent, nor were they guided by a definite principle."

<sup>2</sup>Reider, op. cit., p. 205.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., "... the omission of the possessive pronoun 'his' with reference to God (p. 10, n. 6):" (loc. cit.), etc.

<sup>4</sup>Manson, T. W., reviewer, "The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch, by Charles T. Fritsch. Pp. viii+81. Princeton: University Press; London: Milford, 1943. 13s 6d.", The Journal of Theological Studies, 46 (1945), p. 79.

<sup>5</sup>This has been accomplished partially for the Twelve in the course of this investigation.



comparison should be made with those passages in which the usage is non-theological. Whenever similar changes occur in both theological and non-theological passages, the reason for the change must be other than an anti-anthropomorphic bias<sup>1</sup>.

# 1. THE DESCRIPTION OF GOD IN TERMS WHICH IMPLY THAT HE HAS A COMPLETE HUMAN (OR PHYSICAL) FORM<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>An example of this principle: פָּנָיו ("to the face of") is translated as ἐνώπιον where the Face is God's (Hosea 6:2; Haggai 2:14; Malachi 3:16), but it is also translated as ἐνώπιον when the faces are those of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Therefore, this translation of פָּנָיו in Hosea 6:2; Haggai 2:14; and Malachi 3:16 is not an anti-anthropomorphism (see pp. 51ff). Another example is the translation of עֵינָיו as ἐνώπιον both when the eyes (עֵינָיו) are God's and man's. Consequently, this translation of עֵינָיו as ἐνώπιον when the eyes are God's is not an anti-anthropomorphism.

<sup>2</sup>The word נֶפֶשׁ ". . . is seldom specifically mentioned in the Old Testament in connection with God, but, when it is, it is probably a conscious anthropomorphism." (Knight, George A. F., From Moses to Paul [London: Lutterworth Press, 1949], p. 42). This is not, however, to say that נֶפֶשׁ denotes "soul" in the modern sense of that word, but, rather it denotes the totality of God's personality which must also include the concept of "spiritual flesh" (loc. cit.). In two passages נֶפֶשׁ is used of God in the Twelve. Zechariah 11:8 reads in the Hebrew וְנַפְשִׁי בָהֶם יִרְצָה ("And my soul was impatient with them" -- a literal translation). This is reproduced adequately by καὶ βαρυνθήσεται ἡ ψυχή μου ἐπ' αὐτούς ("And my soul will be weighed down against them"). Note that certain Greek translations vary the verb βαρυνθήσεται slightly, and also the preposition ἐπὶ (α' = ἐκολοβῶθαι, σ' = ὀλιγοψύχησα ["to be faint, discouraged, worried"], and θ' = ὀλιγοψύχησεν ["to be faint", etc.]; α', σ' = ἐν; θ' = ἐπ.). Note also that נֶפֶשׁ is rendered as ψυχή and that, if anything, the Septuagint is slightly more anthropomorphic here than the Masoretic Text. The Greek manuscript V O reads χεὶρ ("hand") for ψυχή ("soul") here. The Targum (see page 203) avoids the anthropomorphism by the substitution of בְּסִמְרִי ("By My Word") for נֶפֶשִׁי. In Amos 6:8, on the other hand, נֶפֶשׁ is rendered accurately as καθ' εαυτού. Aquila translates literally as ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ



The Septuagint, like the Masoretic Text, avoids the direct statement that God is a man<sup>1</sup>. It, however, does picture God as ( כֹּאשֶׁר = ον τροπον ) man ( ανθρωπος <sup>2</sup> ). The Septuagint also retains the description of God as a husband ( ανηρ <sup>3</sup> ), possessing a wife ( γυνη <sup>4</sup> ), being

αυτου ("with His Soul"). The Hebrew here is נִשְׁבַּע אֲדֹנָי ( "The Lord Yahweh has sworn by His Soul" -- a more literal translation). The Septuagint and Procksch delete אֲדֹנָי (so Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 923 footnote). The Greek translation renders the Hebrew as οτι ωμοσε κυριος καθ' εαυτου ("For the Lord hath sworn by himself."). It gives the meaning of the Hebrew here. The Targum avoids by substituting בְּמִסְרֵיהּ ("By His Word") for בְּנַפְשׁוֹ ("By His Soul") -- see page 203.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. in Hosea 11:9 where כִּי אֵל אֲנִי וְלֹא-אִישׁ ("... for I am God and not man," ) is translated literally in the Septuagint as διότι θεός εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ανθρωπος ("For I am God and not a man -- "). The Targum here makes a considerable change in its translation (see page 193).

<sup>2</sup>In Malachi 3:17 the clause וְחִסְלֵתִי עֲלֵיהֶם כֹּאשֶׁר יְחַסֵּר אֶת-בְּנוֹ הָעֹבֵד אֹתוֹ ("... and I will spare them as a man spares his son who serves him."), is translated as καὶ αἰρετιω αυτους ον τροπον αἰρετιζει ανθρωπος τον υιον αυτου τον δουλευοντα αυτω ("And I will make choice of them, as a man maketh choice of a son who serveth him."). Cf. the Targum which is also "literal" (see page 192, footnote 1).

<sup>3</sup>This idea occurs three times: (1) in Hosea 2:4(2) where וְאִנִּי לֹא אִשָּׁהּ ("... and I am not her husband -- ") is rendered faithfully as καὶ ἐγὼ οὐκ ανηρ αυτης ("And I am not her Husband."); (2) in Hosea 2:9(7) where וְאִשׁוֹבָה אֵלַי ("... and [let me] return to my first husband,") becomes καὶ ἐπιστρεψω προς τον ανδρα μου τον προτερον ("... and [I will] return to my former husband,"); and (3) in Hosea 2:18(16) where תִּקְרָא אֵימָּי ("... you will call me, 'My husband',") is carried over adequately as καλεσει με ανηρ μου ("... that she will call Me My husband;"). The Targum here avoids this anthropomorphic description of God; see pages 192 - 200.

<sup>4</sup>In Hosea 2:4(2) כִּי-הִיא לֹא אִשְׁתִּי ("... for she is not my wife,") is rendered literally in the Septuagint as οτι αυτη ου γυνη μου ("... for she is not My wife,") but not in the Targum (see page 202).

betrothed (  $\mu\eta\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omega$  <sup>1</sup>), etc.

Furthermore, not only may the Greek retain at times an anthropomorphism but actually may heighten this description of Deity as a human being. Thus, for example, in Hosea 11:4 the Greek translation adds the word "man" (  $\alpha\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$  ) which increases slightly the anthropomorphic simile although altering the comparison used:

ואהיה להם כמרים  
על על לחיהם

. . . and I became to them  
as one who eases the yoke  
on their jaws,<sup>2</sup>

και εσομαι αυτοις ως  
ραπιζων ανθρωπος  
επι τας σιαγονας αυτου<sup>3</sup>

Now I will be to them as  
a man who slappeth his  
cheeks,<sup>4</sup>

The Septuagint<sup>5</sup> here reduces God more to the level of a man than the Hebrew which, moreover, keeps Israel in a very subordinate position in relation to Deity. The

---

<sup>1</sup>In Hosea 2:21(19)f. the phrase  $\text{וארשהיך לי}$  ("And I will betroth you to me . . .") occurs three times and is reproduced faithfully each time in the Septuagint as  $\text{και μνηστευσωμαι σε εμαυτω}$  ("And I will betroth you to Me"). In the Targum this anthropomorphism is avoided; see page 202.

<sup>2</sup>See page 13, footnote 3.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Symmachus,  $\text{[και] ενουμισθην αυτοις ως ο επιθεις ζυγον επι τας σιαγονας [αυτων]}$  ("I was esteemed to them as one placing a yoke on their cheeks"), and Aquila,  $\text{ως αιρων ζυγον}$  ("as one bearing a yoke").

<sup>4</sup>Pell's edition of Thompson's translation of the Septuagint is used throughout for the translation of Septuagint unless otherwise noted. This procedure has not been fully carried out in the footnotes.

<sup>5</sup>The Greek translation is obviously more derogatory of Deity than the Hebrew.

Targum<sup>1</sup> is clearly anti-anthropomorphic here, but its Hebrew 'Vorlage' was very similar, if not identical, to our present Masoretic text. On the other hand, the text which the Greek translator(s)<sup>2</sup> possessed possibly varied slightly from our received text, e.g.,

[אדם] ואהיה להם ככרס<sup>3</sup>  
(ם) על לחיו (הם)<sup>4</sup>

And I will be to them as  
one making smooth<sup>5</sup> [a man]  
upon his (their) cheeks."<sup>6</sup>

or,

---

<sup>1</sup>See pages 193f.

<sup>2</sup>Hereafter referred to in the singular.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint = כרס (so Houtsma [so Harper, W. R., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1905), p. 361]; Ruben [Harper, loc. cit.; Ruben, P., Critical Remarks Upon Some Passages of the Old Testament (London: Luzac and Co., 1896), p. 19]; and Scharfberg [so Vollers, K., "Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 3 (1883) -- hereafter referred to as Vollers I -- p. 255]).

<sup>4</sup>Certain manuscripts omit one כרס (Kennicott, B., Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus, [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1780], II, p. 255; De-Rossi, J.B., Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti, [Parmae: Ex Regio Typographaeo, 1786], III, p. 179).

<sup>5</sup>The verb means "to make smooth" (Brown, Driver, and Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952], p. 598.

<sup>6</sup>A free translation.

ואהיה לכם<sup>1</sup> כמכה  
[אדם] על (ם) לחיו (הם)<sup>2</sup>

. . . and I will be to them  
as one smiting<sup>3</sup> a man upon  
his (their) cheeks.<sup>4</sup>

These texts differ from the Masoretic Text essentially in only two particulars. The final αὐτοῦ ("his") need not point to a different text (לחיו) but probably is a harmonization arising from לחיהם. Likewise the ἀνθρώπος ("man") does not require necessarily a אדם ("man") in the translator's Hebrew text<sup>5</sup>. This passage illustrates both the very strong anthropomorphic nature of the Septuagint<sup>6</sup> and the uncertainty of the Hebrew text which the translator possessed.

There exist very few examples in the Septuagint which even at first glance appear to avoid describing God as a man<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint = כמכה (so Vollers, *loc. cit.*); plus אדם (so Vollers, according to Harper [*op. cit.*, p. 361], Marti [so Harper, *loc. cit.*; Marti, K., *Das Dodekapropheton* (Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1904), p. 87]). Valetton, Guthe, Nowack, Halévy, Harper, Oort [Oort, H., *Textus Hebraici Emendationes* (Lugdun, Batavia: E. J. Brill, 1900), p. 139], and Graetz, H. (*Emendationes* [Breslau: S. Schottlaender, 1893], II, p. 14) read כמיהם with the Syriac (so Harper, *loc. cit.*).

<sup>2</sup>See page 40, footnote 4.

<sup>3</sup>See Brown, Driver, Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 645 for the verb נכה.

<sup>4</sup>A free translation.

<sup>5</sup>It may have been added merely to express more clearly the idea of the Hebrew (according to the translator's view).

<sup>6</sup>See pages 161f.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. in Zechariah 10:9 where cod. 86<sup>mg</sup> reads ἐπεγερῶ ("I will raise up") for σπερῶ ("I will sow"); perhaps that is an anti-anthropomorphism.



Hardly an example of a real anti-anthropomorphism occurs in the Septuagint<sup>1</sup> anywhere. A translation which might appear at first to be anti-anthropomorphic occurs in another clause in Hosea 11:4. The rendering of the preceding clause<sup>2</sup>, however, makes it very unlikely that the translation of לִנְכִל ("I fed (him)") by δυνήσομαι αὐτῷ<sup>3</sup> (= לִנְכִל לְ, "I will prevail over him") is an anti-anthropomorphism. The portrayal of God as prevailing over a person is scarcely less anthropomorphic than the original picture of feeding. Moreover, the translator's Hebrew text may have been deficient in the yodh (י) and the waw (ו). If his text was deficient, then the לִנְכִל ("I fed") would have appeared in his text as לְכִל, which he easily could have vocalized as a first person singular qal (hophal) imperfect of לָכַל<sup>4</sup> ("to prevail") instead of as a first person singular Hiphil imperfect of לָכַל ("to feed"). The αὐτῷ, moreover, does not require either

<sup>1</sup>I.e., the Septuagint translation of the Minor Prophets. Cf. page 32, footnote 1.

<sup>2</sup>See pages 39ff.

<sup>3</sup>α' = βρώματα ("food, meat"), θ' = βρωσιν ("meat"), and σ' = τροφήν ("nourishment, food").

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 906, footnote; Nyberg, H.S., (*Studien zum Hoseabuche*, [Uppsala: A.B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1935], p. 85); Wutz, F., (*Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* [Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1933], II, p. 355); and Ryben (*op. cit.*, p. 19). Wutz (*loc. cit.*) considers that the Septuagint is here correct ("... denn G liest richtig לִנְכִל δυνήσομαι αὐτῷ ..."). If this is correct, then perhaps the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic since these words "... indicate most clearly, that if Israel would wrangle again with God, he shall be conquered ...". (Ryben, *loc. cit.*)



an original, - or 17 but was added possibly to supply the necessary object for the verb in Greek. The Targum<sup>1</sup> and the Syriac ("they might feed") clearly are based upon a text similar to the Masoretic text. Possibly they go back, like the Septuagint, to a text, such as, e.g., 1738, although their translation could result from a different vocalization of the same consonantal text as the Masoretic text.

Likewise, it is very uncertain whether the rendering of 1738<sup>2</sup> ("judge") by τας φυλας<sup>3</sup> ("the tribes") in Micah 4:14(5:1)<sup>4</sup> reflects either a different consonantal text<sup>5</sup> or

<sup>1</sup>See page 199.

<sup>2</sup>Ewald (G. H. A. von, Commentary on the Prophets of Old Testament, translator J. F. Smith [London: Williams and Norgate, 1876], II, p. 316), Wade (G. W., The Books of the Prophets Micah Obadiah Joel and Jonah, [London: Methuen and Co., 1925], p. 40), and Marti (op. cit., p. 286) consider 1738 to refer to the King (cf. Amos 2:13). Smith (J. M. P., [Smith, Ward and Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1911), p. 101]) considers that it may refer either to Hezekiah or Yahweh - king.

<sup>3</sup>φυλας in B - 68, CyrP; τον κριτην ("the judge") in Ach., α', σ', θ' = Masoretic Text. The Syriac ("shepherd") = 1738 ?? (ibid., p. 100).

<sup>4</sup>The Masoretic Text = 7870' 1738 18 1878-77 13' 1738 ("With a rod they strike upon the cheek the judge of Israel.").  
 AQ — Septuagint = εν ραβδω παταξουσιν επι σιαγωνα τας φυλας του Ισραηλ ("With a rod they will smite on the cheek the tribes of Israel.").

<sup>5</sup>Vollers, K. ("Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 4 (1884) [Hereafter referred to as Vollers, II, op. cit.], p. 8); van Hoonacker (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 100), Wütz (op. cit., p. 248), and Taylor, J., (The Masoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Book of Micah, [London: Williams and Norgate, 1890], p. 110) consider that the Septuagint read a different text, 1738.

a theological bias. The Targum<sup>1</sup> and one codex<sup>2</sup> read <sup>ל</sup>יפס. This reading avoids the anthropomorphism<sup>3</sup>. Since all the descriptions of God as judging are reproduced faithfully elsewhere by the translator, he probably misread the <sup>ב</sup> as a <sup>ב</sup>. This confusion of <sup>ב</sup> and <sup>ב</sup> is common in the Septuagint, especially the confusion of <sup>ל</sup>שכ and <sup>ל</sup>שפ<sup>4</sup>.

Although the rendering of <sup>ל</sup>אסרם ("I chastise them;<sup>5</sup>") in Hosea 10:10 as παιδεύσαι αὐτούς<sup>6</sup> ("to chastise them"<sup>5</sup>) avoids the anthropomorphic description, it does not necessarily reflect a change because of a theological belief upon the part of the translator. Moreover, since the idea of correction and instruction by God is maintained in the

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum reads <sup>ל</sup>יפס ("judges") which is the equivalent of the Hebrew <sup>ל</sup>שפס ("judges").

<sup>2</sup>De Rossi, *op. cit.*, p. 198 (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 100).

<sup>3</sup>They are followed by Dathe and Graetz (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 100).

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Numbers 25:25; 2 Samuel 7:7; 1 Chronicles 17:6; 28:1 (Kennedy, J., *An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament*, [Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1928], p. 15 and footnote).

<sup>5</sup>A literal translation.

<sup>6</sup><sup>α</sup>, <sup>σ</sup>, <sup>ι</sup>, <sup>λ</sup> <sup>Ι</sup>, Th. = παιδεύω ("I chastise"). The Syriac = <sup>ל</sup>אסרם (Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 349). Oort [*op. cit.*, p. 139], Marti [*op. cit.*, p. 82], Dathe, Oettli, Graetz [*op. cit.*, p. 14], Nowack, and Harper (so Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 350) emend following the Syriac to <sup>ל</sup>אסרם<sup>[ו]</sup>. Cf. also Driver ("Linguistic and Textual Problems: Minor Prophets", *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 39 (1938), p. 160) who retains the same consonantal form and meaning as the Masoretic Text but with a different vocalization. The Septuagint = <sup>ל</sup>אסרם (Vollers, [I, *op. cit.*, p. 254]; so Harper [*op. cit.*, p. 349]).

Septuagint of Hosea 7:12<sup>1</sup>(cf. 15[14]<sup>2</sup> and 5:2<sup>3</sup>), the reason for the Septuagint's rendering may be that the translator understood the root to be אָסַר ("to bind, tie") but assumed that it had the same meaning as יָסַר has in Biblical Hebrew<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>In Hosea 7:12 אִיסְרָם ("I will chastise them. . .") is rendered literally as παιδεύω αὐτούς ("I will chastise them. . .") -- a literal translation; cf. the Targum which softens slightly. See page 207.

<sup>2</sup>In Hosea 7:15 the reason for the Septuagint's translation of ἐπαίδευσθῃσαν ἐν ἐμοὶ ("They were corrected by Me" -- a literal translation) for וְאֲנִי יִסְרֶהָ ("And I chastise . . .") -- a literal translation) is uncertain. Probably, as Procksch (op. cit., p. 902, footnote), Harper (op. cit., p. 300), et al., the Septuagint omitted the וְאֲנִי יִסְרֶהָ as a dittograph, and the Greek here represents the translation of יִסְרוּ בִּי (" . . . they rebel against me.") of verse 14 (see pages 100f.). If the ἐπαίδ. ἐν ἐμοὶ here is the translation of וְאֲנִי יִסְרֶהָ, then the Septuagint represents a slight softening of the anthropomorphism of the Masoretic Text. Perhaps it is best, however, to delete וְאֲנִי יִסְרֶהָ with the Septuagint as Procksch (loc. cit.); Robinson, T.H. (Robinson and Horst, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, [O. Eissfeldt, ed., *Handbuch zum alten Testament*, Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1938], p. 30); Reuben (op. cit., p. 14); and Cheyne, T.K., (*Critica Biblica* [London: Adam and Charles Black, 1904], p. 124) and connect יִסְרוּ בִּי (considered as a passive) with verse fifteen. "The usual meaning of יָסַר, chasten, punish, . . . gives no sense. If MT is retained it must mean trained, or disciplined," (Harper, op. cit., p. 306). The Targum retains יָסַר and slightly softens it; see pages 207f.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint (ἐγὼ δὲ παιδεύτης ὑμῶν = "But I am your corrector.") comparatively literally translates the Hebrew וְאֲנִי מוֹסֵר לְכֻלָּם (" . . . but I will chastise [or am a corrector of] all of them."). For לְכֻלָּם the Septuagint may have read (or altered to) לְכֻלָּם (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 899, footnote).

<sup>4</sup>Driver, G.R., (op. cit., p. 160), states "Perhaps וְאִיסְרָם 'that I may chastise them' and וְאִיסְרָם . . . may be read on the assumption אָסַר as a by form of יָסַר, just as the Aram. אָסַר and יָסַר: 'bound' exist side by side". His footnote to this reads: "Cp. Hos. vii 15 and Jb. iv 3 (s. Driver in J.T.S. xxxvi 295-296)."

Alternatively, the Hebrew text which he was translating may have had<sup>1</sup> an  $\cdot$  instead of the  $\ast$  in the Masoretic Text.

The remaining translations which possibly may exhibit anti-anthropomorphic changes are of a more lexical nature. In Micah 1:2<sup>2</sup>, for instance, the Greek states that God will be among the people for a testimony<sup>3</sup> ( εἰς μαρτυριον <sup>4</sup>)<sup>5</sup>. This is more probably an attempt to translate נָעַל ("witness") freely than for the translation to have resulted from anti-anthropomorphic prejudices, especially since in Malachi 3:5<sup>6</sup> and 2:14<sup>7</sup> the noun and verb, respectively, are translated literally.

<sup>1</sup>Or the text may have been misread.

<sup>2</sup>The Hebrew וְיִהְיֶה אֲדֹנָי יְהוֹה בְּכֶם לְעֵד ("... and let the Lord God be a witness against you," ) is translated as καὶ ἔσται κύριος ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτυριον ("And the Lord will be among (against) you for a testimony." -- a free translation). This translation more likely results from a pro-Israel bias than from any anti-anthropomorphic tendency. Procksch (op. cit., p. 933 footnote) deletes אֲדֹנָי with A, Q.

<sup>3</sup>The abstract for the concrete (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 34).

<sup>4</sup>α', εἰς μαρτυρα ("witness"); σ' testificans = διαμαρτυρούμενος ("protest, bear witness").

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Targum, page 211.

<sup>6</sup>The Hebrew, וְהִיִּיתִי עֵד מְהֵרָה ("I will be a swift witness . . ."), is rendered literally as καὶ ἔσομαι μαρτυρὶς ταχὺς ("and [I will] be a swift witness. . ."); cf. the Targum (see page 211, footnote 1) which avoids the anthropomorphism by the use of Memra.

<sup>7</sup>The Hebrew, כִּי-יְהוֹה הָעֵד בֵּינֵךְ ("Because the Lord was witness . . . between you. . ."), is reproduced faithfully as οτι κύριος διαμαρτυράτο ἀνα μέσον σου ("Because God was a witness between thee. . ."). The Targum here is also literal, see page 210.



The translation of the verb,  $\tau\rho\delta$ <sup>1</sup>, ("to visit", "punish") in the Septuagint presents a difficulty. This verb occurs eighteen times in the Twelve and usually means "to punish" when it is used in conjunction with the preposition  $\epsilon\upsilon$  ("upon, against"). This combination ( $\epsilon\upsilon \tau\rho\delta$ ) is translated normally by  $\epsilon\chi\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\omega$  ("to avenge, punish")  $\epsilon\pi\iota$ <sup>2</sup>, but in two passages, Hosea 4:14 and Zechariah 10:3 (first), the verb is rendered  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("to look at, inspect, visit"), a translation which is appropriate for the alternate meaning of visiting. In Hosea 4:14 and Zechariah 10:3 the influence of other Greek manuscripts may be seen because in Hosea 1:4 Aquila uses  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("visit") and in Hosea 2:13(15); 4:9; and Zephaniah 1:8 the other manuscripts ( $\omicron\iota\lambda'$ ) use  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  where  $\epsilon\chi\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\omega$  ("punish") might have been anticipated. The remaining seven passages in which  $\tau\rho\delta$  ("punish, visit") occurs without  $\epsilon\upsilon$  ("upon") are translated four times by  $\epsilon\chi\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\omega$  ("punish")<sup>3</sup> and three times by  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ <sup>4</sup> ("visit"). These translations cannot be considered, therefore, to result from theological motives; they probably, however, reflect the

---

<sup>1</sup>This verb occurs always in the Twelve in a theological passage.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 2:13(15); 4:9; Amos 3:2,14 (2nd); Zephaniah 1:8,9,12; 3:7; cf. Hosea 12:2(3) where  $\epsilon\chi\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\omega$  ("avenge") occurs without the  $\epsilon\pi\iota$  ("upon").

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 1:14; 8:13; 9:9; Amos 3:14 (first).

<sup>4</sup>Zephaniah 2:7; Zechariah 10:3 (second); 11:16. That the idea of motion was evident in Zechariah 11:16 is clear from the translation  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\rho\epsilon\psi\omega$  ("to turn about") in 130'.



translator's exegesis (or understanding) of these passages.

A translation which is probably anti-anthropomorphic occurs in Malachi 2:17<sup>1</sup> (twice). Apparently the gross anthropomorphism of wearying God (  $\text{yā'}$  hiphil)<sup>2</sup> was too offensive, and, therefore, the translator softened the idea by the use of  $\text{παροξυνω}$  <sup>3</sup> ("to urge, irritate, provoke, excite", etc.). This translation is still anthropomorphic, but the idea of making God weary is avoided. The possibility that this is an anti-anthropomorphism is increased by the secular use in Habakkuk 2:13<sup>4</sup>, where the  $\text{qal}$  stem occurs and is translated by  $\text{εκλειπω}$  ("to pass over, omit, forsake, cease, depart, fail, die", et al.). In the latter instance,  $\text{yā'}$  was apparently understood to be from the root,  $\text{yā'}$  ("to expire, die")<sup>5</sup>. There exist, however, so few instances

<sup>1</sup>The Targum is closer to the Masoretic Text than to the Septuagint. See page 211.

<sup>2</sup>The Hebrew,  $\text{וַיִּפְּחֵם יְהוָה בְּקִלְבֵּיכֶם וּבְקִלְבֵּי הָעָם וּבְקִלְבֵּי הָאֲרָצִים וּבְקִלְבֵּי הָאֲנָשִׁים וּבְקִלְבֵּי הָאֲנָשִׁים וּבְקִלְבֵּי הָאֲנָשִׁים}$  ("You have wearied the Lord with your words. Yet you say, 'How have we wearied him?'"), is translated as  $\text{Οἱ παροξυνοντες τον θεον εν τοις λογοις υμων και ειπατε εν τινι παρωξυναμεν}$  ("You have provoked God with your sayings. And do you ask, by what have we provoked him?"). Procksch (op. cit., p. 975, footnote) adds here  $\text{אֹתוֹ}$  ("him") with the Septuagint (according to Procksch). Only a few Septuagint manuscripts, rel. (W. Clem. Chr. II 462 VI 44 Lucif. Spec.), add  $\text{αὐτον}$  or even  $\text{σε}$  (C, Hi<sup>p</sup>); cf. one Hebrew manuscript =  $\text{וַיִּפְּחֵם}$  (Kennicott, op. cit., p. 304).

<sup>3</sup>Only occurs four times in the Twelve; in the other two instances it translates  $\text{וַיִּפְּחֵם}$ . Ziegler considers it = Masoretic Text here (Ziegler, op. cit., p. 334, notes).

<sup>4</sup>The only other instance in the Twelve.

<sup>5</sup>Could this be the case in Malachi 2:17? Cf. one manuscript which reads  $\text{וַיִּפְּחֵם}$  (Kennicott, op. cit., p. 304).

of this verb (צָרָה) -- only three times in the Twelve -- that no certain conclusion can be reached.

Similarly, the reason for the variation in the translations of צָרָה ("to smelt, refine, test") in Zechariah 13:9<sup>1</sup> as πυρω ("to burn up, test by fire") and in Malachi 3:2f<sup>2</sup> as a form of χωνευω (= "to cast, smelt") is uncertain. The first translation probably was influenced by the close proximity of the preceding πυρ ("fire"), yet both Greek verbs are fairly literal reproductions of the Hebrew verb.

Finally, the verb, נָחַן ("to test, try"), occurs three times and is translated differently each time. In one passage, Zechariah 13:9<sup>3</sup> the translation is fairly literal. The anthropomorphic idea of God trying or testing metal is retained. The situation is different in the other two passages which refer to men trying or testing God. These two are discussed in a later place<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Hebrew, וְצִרְפָּתֶם כֶּסֶד אֶת-הַכֶּסֶד ("...and I, [i. e., God, will] refine them as one refines silver,"), is translated καὶ πύρωσω αὐτοὺς ὡς πύρουται τὸ ἀργύριον ("... and [I have] tried them as silver is tried,").

<sup>2</sup>The Hebrew, כִּי-הוּא לִמֶּשֶׁת כֶּסֶד . . . וְיֹשֶׁב כֶּסֶד ("For he is like a refiner's fire . . . he will sit as a refiner . . ."), is translated as διότι αὐτὸς ἐπιπορεύεται ὡς πῦρ χωνευτηρίου . . . καὶ καθίσταται χωνεύων ("Since he is coming like the fire of a refiner's furnace; . . . He will sit refining . . .").

<sup>3</sup>The Hebrew, וְנִחַנְתִּים כֶּסֶד אֶת-הַכֶּסֶד ("... and [I will] test them as gold is tested,"), is reproduced faithfully as καὶ δοκιμῶ αὐτοὺς ὡς δοκιμάζεται τὸ χρυσίον ("... and [I have] proved them as gold is proved,").

<sup>4</sup>See pages 275f.

In this first section several passages which, in the Septuagint, may reflect an anti-anthropomorphic bias on the part of the translator have been considered; however, in not one passage <sup>is</sup> there a specific example which unquestionably must be due to this motive! Other passages containing the same idea (expressed by verbs or substantives) were found to be translated literally (or accurately), to retain or increase<sup>1</sup> the anthropomorphic coloring, etc.

In several passages, moreover, the translation easily may represent a different (or misread) 'Vorlage' rather than a theological translation. This may be the situation in Hosea 11:4. Twice in the passages examined the Greek translation involves only the mistaking of one Hebrew consonant for another similar one.

The translation which is most probably anti-anthropomorphic occurs in Malachi 2:17 (twice), but this cannot be definitely established because of the infrequency of the occurrences of  $\gamma\iota$  and because of the anthropopathic nature of the translation. Therefore, the conclusion cannot yet be reached that the translator of the Twelve was motivated by a spiritual concept of God which required him to avoid or soften the grosser anthropomorphisms of Deity.

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Hosea 11:4. See pages 39ff.

## 2. THE POSSESSION BY GOD OF PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

The conclusion reached in the preceding section<sup>1</sup> remains valid for the passages in the Masoretic Text which describe God as having parts of the human body (i.e., possessing eyes, nose, mouth, face, etc.) when compared with the Septuagint renderings. In general the anthropomorphic coloring is retained, and once is even increased<sup>2</sup>.

## (1) THE FACE OF GOD

Generally speaking, the Hebrew פָּנִים ("faces") is translated by προσωπον ("a face"), the exact Greek equivalent -- in fact, προσωπον ("face") almost always translates פָּנִים ("faces") except when the word, פָּנִים ("faces"), is found in conjunction with a preposition (e.g., לְפָנֶיךָ = "before the face[s] of"), whether the reference is to the face of man or of God<sup>3</sup>. Possibly the "Face(or Presence) of God" was used so generally at this time as an intermediary that ". . . the original significance of the Hebrew [i.e., of a literal, physical face] was hardly [if at all] felt."<sup>4</sup> Hence, the translator may have considered the expression, the 'Face of God' to refer to the Intermediary, the 'Presence of God', and,

---

<sup>1</sup>Pages 37 - 50 inclusive.

<sup>2</sup>See page 151.

<sup>3</sup>In a few instances the simple פָּנִים is not translated by προσωπον in the Septuagint, e.g., in Zechariah 7:2 where the Septuagint does not translate פָּנִים; see page 53 footnote 4.

<sup>4</sup>Johnson, op. cit., p. 157.





consequently, to have no need to render it other than literally.

Professor Johnson's<sup>1</sup> observation is especially true of the derived prepositional phrases<sup>2</sup>, e.g., פָּנֶיךָ ("to the face[s] of"). Unlike the Pentateuch, however, these prepositional phrases are not "... consistently translated in the Septuagint by ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, ἀπεναντί, and ἐναντί (before),"<sup>3</sup> e.g., פָּנֶיךָ is translated three times<sup>4</sup> ἐνώπιον, once<sup>5</sup> πρὸς με, and twice<sup>6</sup> literally. The phrases פָּנֶיךָ<sup>7</sup> and פָּנֶיךָ<sup>8</sup> always are rendered literally. Therefore, the derived prepositional phrases signified to the translator the presence of God, i.e., being before God. Hence to the translator the Greek expressions, ἐνώπιον θεοῦ

---

<sup>1</sup>Loc. cit., He used the preceding quotation when he had reference to the prepositional phrases which contain פָּנֶיךָ.

<sup>2</sup>See pages 4-7.

<sup>3</sup>Fritsch, op. cit., p. 12, footnote 8. There the reference is to פָּנֶיךָ and its variants. He maintains that in the Pentateuch the Septuagint consistently translates these prepositional phrases by ἐνώπιον, etc.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 6:2 (V, Q, L<sup>1</sup> - 613 - 764, C<sup>1</sup>-538 - 68 Th. Tht. Thph. [= III 1197] read ἐναντίον for ἐνώπιον); Haggai 2:14; Malachi 3:16; cf. the non-theological use in Zechariah 12:8. The Targum translates using מִפְּנֵי = "before" (see pages 233f.).

<sup>5</sup>Jonah 1:2.

<sup>6</sup>Habakkuk 3:5; Malachi 3:1; cf. Nahum 1:6.

<sup>7</sup>Jonah 1:3 (twice), 10.

<sup>8</sup>Nahum 1:5; Habakkuk 2:20; Zephaniah 1:7; Haggai 1:12; Zechariah 2:13(17); Malachi 3:14.



("before God") and προ προσωπον θεου ("before the face of God") would convey exactly the same idea, i.e., in the presence of God.

Even the very strong anthropomorphic expression, **וַיַּמְשִׁיכֵם לְפָנָיו** ("to make the Face of Deity sweet [or pleasant]<sup>1</sup>), is translated accurately. The **לְפָנָיו** is rendered with its metaphorical meaning<sup>2</sup>, and the **פָּנָיו** ("faces") is translated three<sup>3</sup> times literally and omitted once<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>A literal translation.

<sup>2</sup>In Zechariah 7:2; 8:22; and Malachi 1:9 **וַיַּמְשִׁיכֵם** ("to propitiate") is translated by *εξιλασκομαι* with its ordinary classical meaning of "to propitiate"; but in Zechariah 8:21 the verb used is *δεομαι* ("to beg" or "pray"). The translation of **וַיַּמְשִׁיכֵם** ("to propitiate") by *εξιλασκομαι* is so unusual that there may be a reason for its use here. In Zechariah 7:2 and Malachi 1:9 there is a tone of contempt present in the context, and it may have been used to indicate the translator's contempt for anyone who would consider it possible to placate Yahweh -- a concept unworthy of Him. In Zechariah 8:22 the heathen are coming to Yahweh, and the translator may have selected, deliberately, therefore, *εξιλασκομαι*. The choice of *δεομαι* for **וַיַּמְשִׁיכֵם** in the preceding verse when the reference is to the Israelites indicates that the translator has changed, probably deliberately, the Greek verb in Zechariah 8:22 (cf. Dodd, C.H., *op. cit.*, p. 87).

<sup>3</sup>In Zechariah 8:21 **וַיַּמְשִׁיכֵם לְפָנָיו** ("... to entreat the favor of the Lord,") is translated as *δεηθῆναι του προσωπου κυριου* ("... to pray before the Lord..."); in 8:22 it is rendered as *και του εξιλασκεσθε το προσωπον κυριου* ("... and to conciliate the favor of the Lord,"); and in Malachi 1:9 **וְעַתָּה יִמְשִׁיכֵם לְפָנָיו** ("And now entreat the favour of God,") becomes *και νυν εξιλασκεσθε το προσωπον του θεου υμων* ("And now you propitiate your God" -- a free translation).

<sup>4</sup>In Zechariah 7:2 **וַיַּמְשִׁיכֵם לְפָנָיו** ("... to entreat the favour of the Lord,") is translated adequately as *του εξιλασασθαι τον κυριον* ("... to conciliate... the Lord,") *σ'*, *δεηθῆναι του προσωπου κυριου* ("to ask of the Face of the Lord").

Therefore, the Septuagint does not alter the expression, "the face of God", and the translator may have understood it as the Intermediary, the Presence of Yahweh<sup>1</sup>.

## (2) THE EYES OF GOD

In the Masoretic Text of the Twelve, God is said about a dozen times<sup>2</sup>, to have eyes. Only twice<sup>3</sup> does the Septuagint render  $\text{בְּעֵינָיו}$  (apart from prepositional phrases) seemingly other than literal. Moreover, the prepositional phrase,  $\text{בְּעֵינָיו}$  ("by the eyes of"), referring to God's eyes, twice<sup>4</sup> is translated  $\text{ἐνώπιον}$ <sup>5</sup> ("before").

The two passages in which the Septuagint may have softened or avoided the statement that God possesses eyes

---

<sup>1</sup>See G.H. Dix's article "The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits" in the Journal of Theological Studies, 28 (1927): 233-50. Especially note pages 237ff where he points out that, when the term 'the Angel of the Presence' (and the earlier term, 'the Angel of Yahweh') was difficult or impossible to use (*ibid.*, p. 238), the Septuagint translators of the later books called the Angel, 'the Presence of God'. Although the translator of the Twelve did not go this far, this fact concerning the later translators supports the probability that the translator of the Twelve regarded 'the Presence of God' as an intermediary device.

<sup>2</sup>In Amos 9:4 in A<sup>1</sup> 49  $\text{τὸ πρόσωπον}$  ("the face") occurs for  $\text{τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς}$  ("the eyes"); in Jonah 2:5, a facie tua ("from your face") -- so Ach. Sa.

<sup>3</sup>Zechariah 4:10; 9:1.

<sup>4</sup>Zechariah 8:6; Malachi 2:17 -- in the former V reads  $\text{ἐνώπιον}$  ("before"); cf. also 449<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>5</sup>The same situation occurs non-theologically in Haggai 2:3; Zechariah 8:6.

( עַיִן ) are found in Zechariah -- 9:1 and 4:10. In

Zechariah 9:1 the Greek is as anthropomorphic<sup>1</sup> as the Hebrew:

כִּי לַיהוָה עַיִן אָדָם<sup>2</sup>      For to Yahweh belongs the  
eye of a man.<sup>3</sup>

διότι κυριος εφορα ανθρωπους<sup>4</sup>      Because the Lord looks  
upon men.<sup>5</sup>

Obviously the Greek translation conveys essentially the same idea as the Hebrew, especially if the Hebrew means that "Yahweh has an eye on mankind"<sup>6</sup>. If the meaning of the

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Amos 9:8 where the expression, the "eyes of Yahweh", is translated literally.

<sup>2</sup>The meaning of the Hebrew here is uncertain.

<sup>3</sup>This is a possible translation. The Revised Standard Version translates, "For to the Lord belong the cities of Aram," thus emending the text as Klosterman (according to Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1912), p. 270), Mitchell (loc. cit.), Hörst (Robinson and Hörst, op. cit., p. 238), Marti (op. cit., p. 427), and Procksch (op. cit., p. 965, footnote) emend the text to עַיִן אֲרָם ("cities of Aram"). Other suggested emendations also involve the substitution of א for ע (as one codex does), e.g., עַיִן אֲרָם by Michaelis (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 270), Drake (so Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1879), p. 566), and Graetz (op. cit., p. 24); and עַיִן אֲרָם by Ball (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 270).

<sup>4</sup>The Syriac and Targum use a passive construction for the Septuagint's active construction (Jansma, T., "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix - xiv", Oldtestamentische Studien, P.A.H. De Boer, editor, Deel VII (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950), p. 62).

<sup>5</sup>A free translation.

<sup>6</sup>The Hebrew may mean that "Yahweh has an eye on mankind" (as the Septuagint, the Targum [see page 218], the Syriac, Cyril of Alexandria, Grotius, de Dieu, Drusius, Marck, Pemble, Newcome, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Hitzig, Ewald, Burger, Keil, Köhler, Reuss, Stade, Wellhausen, Nowack, Smith, G.A., (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 270), Drake (so Wright, C.H.H., op. cit., p. 566), et al.

Hebrew is that "Yahweh possesses a human eye"<sup>1</sup>, then the translation into Greek represents a softening of the anthropomorphic expression of the Hebrew.

Certain Greek manuscripts<sup>2</sup> omit κυριου in their translation of Zechariah 4:10:

שִׁבְעַת עֵינֵי יְהוָה  
הֵנֵּה

These seven are the eyes  
of the Lord,

επτα ουτοι οφ-  
θαλμοι εισιν

. . . those seven eyes .  
. . .

Probably Ziegler and Kittel are correct in inserting κυριου following the οφθαλμοι ("eye")<sup>3</sup>. Certain Septuagint manuscripts<sup>4</sup> insert the κυριου ("of the Lord") after the εισιν ("are").

Hence it is uncertain whether there was an omission of κυριου ("of the Lord") at this point in the original

---

<sup>1</sup>Alternatively, the Hebrew may mean that "towards Yahweh the eye of mankind is directed" (so Jerome, Aben Ezra, Rashi, Kimchi [M'Caul, A., Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary upon the Prophecies of Zechariah, (London: James Duncan, 1837), p. 83], Calvin, Blayne, de Ribera, Henderson, Kliefoth, Brendenkamp, Pusey (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 270), Wright (op. cit., pp. 208f, 566), Lowe, W.H., The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah (London: Macmillan and Co., 1882), p. 79), Cohen, A., editor, The Twelve Prophets (Bournemouth: The Soncino Press, 1948), p. 303, et al.). The Hebrew may mean merely, thus, the bare statement, "Yahweh possesses a human eye" -- a very gross anthropomorphism. If this is the meaning of the Hebrew, then the Septuagint, Syriac, and Targum are clearly anthropomorphic softening.

<sup>2</sup>B, 147\*, 233', Arm., Hi<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>So also W.

<sup>4</sup>A', 763, Bo.



Septuagint manuscript. The other versions are not much help because, on the whole, the Syriac follows the Septuagint ("Seven are these eyes of the Lord which gaze upon the whole earth"<sup>1</sup>), and the Targum translates as, *שבעה עיני דנין כלין* ("seven rows [of stones] as these. Before Yahweh have been revealed all the words of the children of men"<sup>3</sup>). Since the Syriac, as well as many Greek manuscripts, supports the originality of *οφθαλμοι κυριου* ("the eyes of the Lord"), it is improbable that any passage occurs in the Septuagint which denies eyes to God.

Several verbs occur in the Masoretic Text which state that God can see and, therefore, possesses eyes. One of these verbs occurs in Malachi 2:13<sup>4</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup>Rignell's translation, "Diese sind die sieben Augen des Herrn, die über die ganze Erde schauen." (Rignell, L.G., *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja* (Lund: C. W. K., Gleerups, 1950), p. 163.)

<sup>2</sup>See page 219.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, Targum, leading Jewish commentators, Calvin, Grotius, Pemble, Dathe, Lowth, Newcome, Theiner, Ewald, Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, et al., connect the words *שבעה עיני* with the words which follow, against the Masoretic Text which makes them the subject of *והיה* -- so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. in Zephaniah 3:15; *ה' פנה ידיו* ("He [God] has cast out your enemy") is translated as *λελυτρωται σε εκ χειρος εχθρων* ("... he hath redeemed thee out of the hand of thine enemies."). See page 97. The Targum alters slightly (see page 222).



מֵאֵין עוֹד כִּנּוֹחַ<sup>1</sup>  
אל-הַכִּנּוּחַ

. . . because he no longer  
regards [looks on] the  
offering . . .

ἐτι ἀξιὸν ἐπιβλεψαί  
εἰς θυσίαν

. . . is it still proper  
to look upon a sacrifice,

The reason for this translation is uncertain, although it may soften the picture given in the Hebrew, of God as looking on (or accepting) sacrifices, from a statement to a question with an impersonal subject. It may represent also an attempt to render the Hebrew into a corresponding idiomatic but literal Greek. If so, the translator probably did regard God as the One Who was observing the sacrifices.

Another verb which conveys the implication that God possesses eyes is שׁוּר ("behold, regard"). This verb occurs in Hosea 13:7 and 14:8(9). The Septuagint, however, does not translate the verb by the same Greek word in both instances. The first passage is:

על-דֶּרֶךְ אֲשׁוּר

. . . I [God] will lurk  
[watch] beside the way.

κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν Ἀσσυρίων<sup>2</sup>

. . . in the way to the  
Assyrians.

<sup>1</sup>The Targum: מְלִיחַ עוֹד אִיחֶפְנָא לְקַרְבָּנָא ("further I do not look back at the offering") = Masoretic Text. The Targum may have translated מֵאֵין according to the meaning of the Aramaic verb מֵאֵין (see page 222).

<sup>2</sup>So also the Syriac, the Vulgate, (so Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 909 footnote), the Arabic (so Davidson, S., *The Hebrew Text* [London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, n.d.], p. 125), Harper, Wellhausen, Valetton, Nowack, Oettli (so Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 392), Robinson [T.H.] (Robinson and Horst, *op. cit.*, p. 50), all ancient interpreters, (so Drake, W., *Notes Critical and Explanatory on the Prophecies of Jonah and Hosea*, [Cambridge: MacMillan and Co., 1853], p. 172), *et al.* This

This translation involves only a vocalization<sup>1</sup> change from  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$  to  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$ . The second passage is:

$\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$  . . . and [I] look on him;<sup>2</sup>  
 $\text{καὶ ἐγὼ κατισχύσω αὐτόν}$  . . . and I will strengthen him.<sup>3</sup>

The latter translation is almost as anthropomorphic as the Masoretic Text. Moreover, it may rest upon a different or misread text<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, these two renderings hardly can be anti-anthropomorphic; it is just as probable that they represent different or misread texts.

The idea of not being hidden may suggest the possibility of sight and also of eyes. In Hosea 5:3 the Septuagint avoids the statement that Israel was not hidden from God:

---

represents only a change of vocalization. Certainly some Hebrew manuscripts must be the original of Septuagint (cf. Nyberg, *op. cit.*, p. 102). Ewald (*op. cit.*, I, p. 303) says that the reference to the Assyrians would be out of place here since only the final punishment of the whole nation was intended. The Targum avoids any anthropomorphic implication; see pages 222f.

<sup>1</sup>Scott, Melville, *The Message of Hosea* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921), p. 150, prefers the Septuagint to the Masoretic Text.

<sup>2</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Targum, see page 223; Syriac =  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$  (so Sebök, according to Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 410) or =  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$  (Nyberg, *op. cit.*, p. 112). Graetz (*op. cit.*, p. 14), according to Harper (*op. cit.*, p. 410), emends to  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$ .

<sup>4</sup>The Septuagint =  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$  so Vollers [*op. cit.*, I, p. 260] according to Harper (*op. cit.*, p. 410); cf. Nyberg (*op. cit.*, p. 112), Wutz (*op. cit.*, p. 276) considers that the Septuagint is equivalent to  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$ .

וְיִסְרָאֵל לֹא הִסְתָּר מִי<sup>1</sup> . . . and Israel is not  
 '100 hid from me;

καὶ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἀπε- . . . when Israel did not  
 στίν<sup>2</sup> ἀπ' ἐμοῦ withdraw from me.

The reason for this alteration hardly can be an objection to the anthropomorphic implication of sight by the Hebrew since the Greek translation is equally, if not more, anthropomorphic. The Hebrew, however, may have been offensive for other reasons, namely, the indirect implication that God is not omniscient or omnipresent, or the Greek may represent a pro-Israel alteration. On the other hand, since the idea of one hiding from God is reproduced faithfully by the Septuagint<sup>3</sup> elsewhere, these suggested reasons do not seem too probable. The most likely possibility is the suggestion that the translator either possessed a different text or misread his text. The Greek verb, ἀπειμι ("to be away, distant") occurs in the Septuagint in only three passages for which a Hebrew original exists. In one of the remaining passages (Proverbs 25:10) the Hebrew verb which it translates is uncertain, but in the other passage (Job 6:13) it translates הָיָה ("to impel, thrust, banish"). Perhaps the translator here read the niphal perfect of הָיָה which he understood to have the meaning of 'to be banished' or 'exiled'. If so, then

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 326, footnote 2.

<sup>2</sup>θ' = Septuagint; Ach (latuit) = Masoretic Text. α' = ἐπεκαλυφθη ("was covered over, veiled"); σ' = ελαβεν.

<sup>3</sup>See pages 128ff.

his translation would reproduce the essential idea of the Hebrew (as he understood it), i.e., "Israel is not banished from God", and also would soften it slightly. An alternate suggestion is that he may have read  $\text{נִחַל}$  (the niph'al perfect of  $\text{נָחַל}$  ("to push/thrust aside")). Thus, he may have been offended by the suggestion (negative) that God might push Israel aside, and so he softened it to say that Israel is not away from God.

---

The expression, "the eyes of God", is carried over literally into the Greek (or at least the concept of sight is). The prepositional phrase,  $\text{בְּעֵינֵי}$  ("by the eyes of"), is translated by  $\text{ἐνώπιον}$  ("before") both with reference to man and to God. The idea of God seeing is softened in Malachi 2:13 (  $\text{נִחַל}$ ). Both occurrences of  $\text{נִחַל}$ , however, are changed. The change in Hosea 5:3, concerning Israel being hidden from God, probably arises from a different or misread text and a pro-Israel bias on the part of the translator. Hence, there exists no positive example of anti-anthropomorphism here.

### (3) THE MOUTH OF GOD

Several expressions which involve the idea of God using or possessing a mouth have been altered at times in the Greek. One of the most interesting of these alterations involves the use of the verb,  $\text{אָנַח}$ , "to answer, respond".



In only three<sup>1</sup> occurrences, when this verb refers to God, does the Greek appropriately translate it by ἀποκρίνω ("to answer"). Of the remaining instances, once<sup>2</sup> the Septuagint interprets the root meaning to be from another verb, נָצַח (root III = "to put down, become low"), and so translates it by ταπεινῶ , ("to make low, humble, abase"). Five times<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Joel 2:19; Habakkuk 2:2; Zechariah 1:13.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 14:9(8); could this be an anti-Ephraim alteration? Cf. Hosea 2:15(17) with respect to Israel. See also Hosea 5:5; 7:10; Malachi 2:12.

<sup>3</sup>The translator reserves the simple ἀκούω ("to hear") always for נָשָׁא ("to hear") in the Twelve. [Twice (Jonah 2:3 W - ἤκουσεν ("He heard"); 62 - ἐπήκουσεν ("He heard, perceived")) and Micah 3:4 נָשָׁא ("answer", etc.) is translated by εἰσακούω ("to hearken" or "give ear to, hear, perceive"); cf. also Micah 3:7 in some Greek manuscripts. This verb, εἰσακούω, elsewhere in Twelve always translates נָשָׁא except once, namely, Zechariah 1:4, where it is the rendering of נָשָׁא ("to give attention to"). Since, however, in the Twelve ἀκούω ("to hear, listen, perceive") translates only נָשָׁא, perhaps the reading of manuscript 62 of εἰσακούω in Jonah 2:3 for ἀκούω is original. Moreover, because ἀκούω translates נָשָׁא both in theological passages (Hosea 2:21(23); Zechariah 10:6; 13:9 [cf. cod. 130<sup>1</sup> which reads ἐπικαλεσθαι αὐτόν ] ) and in non-theological passages (Hosea 2:21(23)f; cf. also Micah 3:7 in certain manuscripts), this translation cannot have been selected because of theological reasons. Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R. (A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented by H.S. Jones, [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951], I, p. 605) give the meaning of 'to answer' for the verb (ἀκούω); cf. Marti's statement in footnote 1, page 63. The translation of נָשָׁא as "for there is no answer from God." as διότι οὐκ ἔσται ὁ εἰσακούων ("... for none will hearken to them") may represent a softening of a statement considered to be derogatory of the character of God. Certain Septuagint manuscripts do not read εἰσακούων. Other readings are: ἀκούων (V, L<sup>1</sup>-36 - 764 C<sup>1</sup> - 68 - 239 Th. Thph.); ἀκούσων (rel.); ὑπακούσων (86<sup>c</sup> 198 233<sup>1</sup> Cyr.<sup>p</sup>); ὑπακούων (1 II (86\*) Tht.); σ' = διότι οὐκ ἦν ἀποκρισις τοῦ θεοῦ ("Because there was not an answer of God."); and θ' = διότι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀποκρισις ἐλωίμ ("Because there is not an answer of Elohim [i.e., God] .").



the translator interprets it to be the equivalent of *ydw* ("to listen to, to hear"<sup>1</sup>). This is fully as anthropomorphic as "to answer", if not more so, and might better suggest that the Hebrew represents a softening of the implication of ears to the idea of answering, which would not suggest a mouth as much as *ydw* ("to listen, hear") because the idea of saying, speaking, word, etc., was accepted generally without seeming to give offence in Judaism.

The concept of speaking, and of a mouth, also is implied by the verb, *אָמַר* ("to declare"). In the Greek rendering of Zechariah 9:12 the anthropomorphism of God declaring is avoided:

*אָמַר ה' הַיּוֹם*

*... today I declare ...*

*και αντι μιας ημερας  
παροικεσιας σου*<sup>3</sup>

*... and for thy one  
day's sojourning. ...*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>"Das Verb *שמע* bedeutet hier erhören," (Marti, K., op. cit., p. 32).

<sup>2</sup>Büttcher (and Ewald) render impersonally, "one announces" (so Wright, op. cit., p. 572). But Wright (loc. cit.) says, "The verb makes it plain that the pronoun of the first person is that which must be supplied. An impersonal rendering would be pointless."; cf. 2 manuscripts (Kennicott, op. cit., p. 297) *אָמַר ה' הַיּוֹם*. Cf. Targum *אָמַר ה' הַיּוֹם* *אָמַר ה' הַיּוֹם* ("To-day also I will send to announce to you", etc.). See page 233.

<sup>3</sup>*παροικεσιας σου* = *אָמַר ה' הַיּוֹם* (so Procksch [op. cit., p. 966 footnotes], Stade [Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft I (1881), p. 17], and Procksch (loc. cit.) emends following the Septuagint (in part at least) to *אָמַר ה' הַיּוֹם*.

*אָמַר ה' הַיּוֹם*.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Amos 4:13. *ἀπαγγελλω* frequently translates *אָמַר*.

<sup>5</sup>The Septuagint is "... a clever attempt to soften the difficulty of the traditional text." (Cheyne, op. cit., p. 186).

This translation avoids the statement that God declares anything by changing the whole reference from God to Israel's captivity. Therefore, the translation may have been selected because of a pro-Israel bias instead of being the result of an anti-anthropomorphic prejudice. Moreover, it may reflect a different or misread text.

The final verb of speaking, which suggests that God may have possessed a mouth, to be considered is קרא ("to call"). This verb occurs in Haggai 1:11:

וָאָקַרָא חֶרֶב עַל-	And I have called for a
הָאָרֶץ	drought upon the land .
	. .
καὶ ἐπαξω <sup>1</sup> ρομφαίαν <sup>2</sup>	. . . and I will bring a
ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν	sword upon this land . .
	<sup>3</sup>

This translation scarcely can be an anti-anthropomorphism, but the Septuagint may represent the original Hebrew text. In this case the Masoretic Text would represent a denial of motion to God. Both possibilities, however, are not as likely as is the assumption that the Greek translation represents a different or misread text. This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that the Septuagint elsewhere freely speaks of God as calling while the Masoretic Text does not hesitate to ascribe motion to God. A suggested misread text or

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text (see page 232).

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint represents a change of pointing only.

<sup>3</sup>This is at least as anthropomorphic as the Masoretic Text.

Hebrew 'Vorlage' for the Septuagint is:

וְקָמָה לִי חֶרֶב וְקָמָה <sup>1</sup> And I will raise a sword  
upon the land. . . .<sup>2</sup>

This last suggestion gains support from the fact that elsewhere, with two exceptions, the translator used a derivative of *καλεω* to translate *קָרָא* when it refers to Deity. In each passage he selected a derivative which he considered to be the most adequate to convey the exact shade of meaning of the Hebrew. Thus in Hosea 11:1<sup>3</sup> He recalls or summons (*μετακαλεω*) His children from Egypt; in Joel 3:5(2:32)<sup>4</sup>, Amos 5:8<sup>5</sup> and 9:6<sup>6</sup> He summons (*προσκαλεω*) the remnant or the sea-waters; in Micah 6:9<sup>7</sup> His voice appeals (*επικαλεω*) to the city. Yet in Amos 7:4<sup>8</sup> it is simply *καλεω*, "the Lord God was calling for a judgment by fire,". Even the two other exceptions retain the idea of calling or speaking. Thus in Zechariah 7:7<sup>9</sup> God has spoken (*λαλεω*) by the prophets, but in verse 13<sup>10</sup> there is a possible pro-Israel

---

<sup>1</sup>One manuscript reads *קָרָא* (so Kennicott, *op. cit.*, p. 289).

<sup>2</sup>A free translation.

<sup>3</sup>See page 232.

<sup>4</sup>See page 232.

<sup>5</sup>See page 232.

<sup>6</sup>See page 232.

<sup>7</sup>See page 232.

<sup>8</sup>See page 232.

<sup>9</sup>See page 232.

<sup>10</sup>See page 232.

softening to εἶπον . These translations of קָרָא ("to call"), therefore, minimize the possibility that the change in Haggai 1:11 was due to accident or a theological bias and supports the more probable suggestion that the translator either possessed a different Hebrew text or else misread the text which he had.

Two other verbs which imply the existence of a mouth are not translated literally in two passages. In one passage, Zephaniah 3:17, the concept of God being silent (שָׁתִּיטֵּשׁ)<sup>1</sup> is altered to the concept of His renewing (καὶ νίει<sup>2</sup>) Israel. Of course, this translation may have been selected to avoid

---

<sup>1</sup>The Hebrew here reads שָׁתִּיטֵּשׁ בְּאַהֲבָתוֹ ("... he [God] will be silent in his love;" -- following the Revised Standard Version, footnote 1, p. 982); this is translated as καὶ καὶ νίει σε ἐν τῇ ἀγαπήσει αὐτοῦ ("And [he will] renew thee in his love;").

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint (also Syriac and Arabic) apparently read (or misread) the text as שָׁתִּיטֵּשׁ, a change of ט to י . Smith (J.M.P.), Buhl, Smith (G.A.), Driver (S.R.), Rothstein, Duhm (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 262) and Procksch (op. cit., p. 954, footnote) emend, following the Septuagint and Syriac, to שָׁתִּיטֵּשׁ . Houbigant, Newcome, Ewald, and Hitzig emend to שָׁתִּיטֵּשׁ (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 262). Müller and van Hoonacker take שָׁתִּיטֵּשׁ = "he roars, effervesces, boils over"; cf. Psalms 45:2 (loc. cit.). The Septuagint, however, may have (mis)read the text as שָׁתִּיטֵּשׁ; the final י arises from the initial י of the following word (Wutz, [op. cit., p. 364], Horst [Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 194], Nowack [Smith, Ward, Bewer, loc. cit.], and Graetz [op. cit., p. 22] so emend). Another change may lie behind the Septuagint's translation (νίει with ν and י with י, i.e., שָׁתִּיטֵּשׁ as Kennedy op. cit., p. 19, Schwalley [F., "Das Buch Ssefanjâ, eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 10 (1890), pp. 206f.], and Oort (op. cit., p. 147] -- so Smith, Bewer, Ward, loc. cit. -- emend.).

the anthropomorphic implication, but it more likely reflects a pro-Israel bias<sup>1</sup> -- especially since the verb is literally translated in Habakkuk 1:13 by παρασιωπησι<sup>2</sup> ("to keep silence"; cf. παρασιωπας in Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion). In a non-theological passage (Micah 7:16) it is rendered by αποκωφομαι ("to become deaf").

The verb, אכל ("to eat"), usually is translated literally, but in Hosea 13:8<sup>3</sup> the statement made by God that He would devour them ( אכלם = ". . . and . . . I will devour them. . .") is translated as καταφαγονται (" . . . they will devour them. . .") which apparently avoids the anthropomorphism. The translator, probably was not attempting to avoid an anthropomorphism here because he leaves the other anthropomorphisms in the same verse unaltered. Therefore, the translator more likely vocalized his text differently, misread<sup>4</sup> his text, or possessed a different text.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the alterations of the Targum; see page 231.

<sup>2</sup>The Targum alters this also; see pages 230f.

<sup>3</sup>The Hebrew, אכלם שם אכלם (" . . . and there I [God] will devour them as a lion [ess] . . .") is translated as και καταφαγονται αυτους εχει σκυμνοι δρυμου (" . . . and the young lions of the forest shall there devour them;"). The Targum supports the Masoretic Text here against the Septuagint (see pages 240f.).

<sup>4</sup>He may have read, of course, a different text, e.g., אכלם as Procksch (op. cit., p. 909 footnote) and Vollers (op. cit., I, p. 258) considers him to have done; cf. Harper, Oort [op. cit., p. 139], Guthe, Marti [op. cit., p. 101] and Nowack (according to Harper, op. cit., p. 392). Driver (G.R.) and Sellin emend to אכלם (so Driver, G.R., op. cit., p. 164; cf. the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic).



Therefore, the Septuagint freely pictures God as speaking, etc. -- actions which imply the existence of a mouth. Moreover, since the "mouth of God" is reproduced faithfully in the Greek, the translator cannot be said to avoid describing God as having a mouth.

#### (4) THE HANDS AND ARMS OF GOD

The Septuagint not only describes God as the possessor of arms but also of hands. In fact, in one passage the Greek translation is stronger in its anthropomorphic description than is the Hebrew. This occurs in Hosea 11:3<sup>1</sup>:

לְקַח בְּאַרְמּוֹ taking by his arm<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Malachi 2:3; see pages 155f.

<sup>2</sup>This form is uncertain; Sharpe, John (Notes and Dissertation Upon the Prophecy of Hosea [Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1884], p. 215; cf. Ezekiel 17:5) considers it to be an apocopated third masculine singular qal perfect of לָקַח ("take"). Others consider it to be a participle or the infinitive absolute. Probably the text should read לְקַח with the Septuagint, Ewald [op. cit., I, p. 290], Steiner, Harper, Olshausen, Umbreit, Orelli, Cheyne [op. cit., p. 127], Oort [op. cit., p. 139], Wellhausen, Ruben [op. cit., p. 19], Guthe, Nowack, Loftman, Oettli, Marti [op. cit., p. 86], (so Harper, op. cit., p. 360), Procksch [op. cit., p. 906, footnote with Targum and Syriac], and Robinson (T.H.), (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 42). Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85) considers that the Septuagint = לְקַח here.

<sup>3</sup>The Revised Standard Version here follows the Septuagint, Syriac, and Vulgate in its translation, ("I took them up in my arms;").

ἀνελαβὸν<sup>1</sup> αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ  
τὸν βραχίονα μου<sup>2</sup>

I took him up in my  
arms.

Here the Hebrew text probably intended to convey the same idea as expressed in the Greek translation<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, this translation may not represent necessarily a heightening of the anthropomorphic picturization, but in any case the Septuagint is very specific here in its anthropomorphic description.

Elsewhere the translator renders literally all passages which state that God has a hand or hands. There may be, however, an anti-anthropomorphic softening<sup>4</sup> in the translation of Jonah 1:4. Here the statement that God hurls ( הָלַח ) a wind<sup>5</sup> is altered so that God raises ( ἐξηγεῖρε ) a wind. It

<sup>1</sup>Vollers considers the Septuagint to have read וְיָחַדָּהּ (Vollers, I., op. cit., p. 255).

<sup>2</sup>Vollers (loc. cit.) and Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85) consider that the Septuagint read וְיָחַדָּהּ. Several Hebrew manuscripts read וְיָחַדָּהּ (Kennicott, op. cit., p. 255; De-Rossi (op. cit., III, p. 179).

<sup>3</sup>Since the Targum supports the Septuagint here, the probability that this statement is correct is increased; see pages 216f. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85) disagrees. He states, "Die Lesarten von GS sind Konjekturen auf Grund der verstümmelten LA anp."

<sup>4</sup>Cf. the Syriac and Targum which translates הָלַח with the same meaning as the Septuagint, e.g., הָרַם ("raise"); cf. Vulgate's misit (so Kalisch, M.H., Bible Studies (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1879), II, p. 151).

<sup>5</sup>The Hebrew, וַיִּהְיוּ הַטֵּיִל רוּחַ-גָּדוֹל ("But the Lord hurled a great wind. . ."), is translated as καὶ κυριὸς ἐξηγεῖρε πνεῦμα ("But the Lord raised a wind. . ."). Several manuscripts (L<sup>1</sup> - 239<sup>c</sup> - 407 87<sup>c</sup> - 68. Sa. Bo. Aeth. Arab. CyrP. Thph. Hi.) add μέγα ("great"). Symmachus also adds μέγα ("great").

is difficult to determine precisely whether this is an anti-anthropomorphism because in the Twelve  $\text{לָּו}$  is found only in this passage. Possibly the Greek translation is not an anti-anthropomorphism but only represents an attempt at a "literal" translation -- especially since the translator may have understood  $\text{לָּו}$  to be from the root  $\text{לָּו}$  with the Aramaic meaning of "to raise".

The picture of God storming or raging (  $\text{לָּו}$  ), i.e., hurling them by means of a storm-wind<sup>1</sup>, is retained essentially in Zechariah 7:14 by  $\text{εξβαλλω}$  <sup>2</sup> ("to cast off")<sup>3</sup>. In Hosea 13:3, however, the basic idea is conveyed more clearly by the Greek verb,  $\text{αποφυσω}$  ("to breathe, blow").

Finally, in Zechariah 2:9(13) God states that He will shake (  $\text{לָּו}$  ) His hand. This the Septuagint softens to bringing (  $\text{επιφέρω}$  ) His hand. Notice that  $\text{לָּו}$  is translated literally by  $\text{χειρ}$  and that the Septuagint retains the essential picture of the Hebrew.

— — — — —

Although two alterations and a softening, which may be anti-anthropomorphic, exist, not one of these examples

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 704.

<sup>2</sup>This is still anthropomorphic and, therefore, may have originated from a desire to give the best possible translation.

<sup>3</sup>The full force of the Hebrew is retained in the Targum. See pages 215f.

present any change which positively has originated from a theological bias.

# (5) THE FEET OF GOD

The only remaining instances, in which translations possibly suggest a desire on the part of the translator to avoid describing Deity as possessing the various parts of the human body, imply that God has feet. In Habakkuk 3:15<sup>1</sup> God is described as treading (  $\text{לָרַח$  )<sup>2</sup> upon the sea with (by means of) His horses. This has been softened by the use of  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\beta\iota\beta\alpha\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ <sup>3</sup>, a causal form of  $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\alpha\iota\nu\omega$  ("to ascend"), which is used correctly to translate the hiphil of the Hebrew verb later on in the same chapter. The Greek thus runs:

"You have caused Your horses to ride into (  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  ) the sea."<sup>4</sup>

Of course, this may mean either that the translator had a different text before him or that he may have been influenced by the hiphil form of the same verb which occurs nearby, thus correcting the text here to what he thought it should have

<sup>1</sup>The Hebrew reads:  $\text{לָרַח בִּיַּם סוּסֶיךָ}$  ("Thou hast trampled the sea with thy horses,").

<sup>2</sup>Elsewhere this verb when it refers to God is translated by  $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\alpha\iota\nu\omega$  ("ascend"), except once where it is rendered by  $\epsilon\lambda\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omega$ .

<sup>3</sup>"The versions, however, support the present M.T." (Stonehouse, G.C.V., The Book of Habakkuk (London: Rivingtons, 1911), p. 249); cf. the Targum's alterations (see page 226).

<sup>4</sup>A free translation. This is still anthropomorphic and may have arisen, therefore, from the desire to translate as well as possible the Hebrew. The Greek is:  $\kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\pi\epsilon\beta\iota\beta\alpha\sigma\alpha\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \iota\pi\pi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \sigma\omicron\upsilon$ .

been originally. Moreover, the translation of *ἐπιβαίνω* ("ascend") for *לָרַג* ("tread") in Amos 4:13 and Micah 1:3 cannot be an anti-anthropomorphic softening because the same translation is used non-theologically in Micah 5:4(5), 5(6)<sup>1</sup>.

— — — — —

Again no conclusive examples of a genuine anti-anthropomorphic trend are found.

X X X X X

This investigation demonstrates that the Septuagint usually describes, both with verbs and nouns, God as the possessor of eyes, ears, and the like. In this section many examples of alterations which might have resulted from theological prejudices have been considered. In each instance either that motive has proved not to be the reason or else it has been seen that there is some other equally probable cause for the change.

A few of these passages may represent either a different text or the same text misread by the translator. Different vocalization may be the reason for other renderings.

The passage which possibly is anti-anthropomorphic occurs in Jonah 1:4. Here, the anti-anthropomorphic

---

<sup>1</sup>In this case note the selection of the verbs in Zechariah 9:13 and Micah 6:15 which adequately translate the Hebrew. Also note that the Septuagint translator was not bound by a stereotyped translation.



possibility is decreased by the consistency of the Versions in softening the statement. This consistently indicates the likelihood that they all understood the root to have the Aramaic meaning of "to raise".

### 3. ANTI-ANIMISTIC ALTERATIONS<sup>1</sup>

The application of the simile, כּאש ("as fire"), in Amos 5:6<sup>2</sup> may refer either to the house of Joseph (Israel) or to God in the Hebrew. Hence, the Septuagint's selection of the house of Joseph as the subject is not necessarily anti-animistic. A similar uncertainty is felt in Hosea 5:12<sup>3</sup> where moth (שׁ) is translated ταραχη<sup>4</sup> ("disorder, confusion"<sup>5</sup>) and rottenness (רָקָב) as

<sup>1</sup>See page xxvi, footnote 9.

<sup>2</sup>The Hebrew, כּאש בֵּית יוֹסֵף ("... lest he [God] break out like fire in the house of Joseph" [Revised Standard Version] or "Lest the house of Joseph break out as fire") is translated as οπως μη αναληψη ως πυρ ο οίκος Ιωσήφ ("... lest the house of Joseph blaze as fire," -- Bagster's translation [Author Unknown, The Septuagint Version (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1879), p. 1088]).

<sup>3</sup>The Hebrew, כּעֵשׂ לֵאפְרַיִם וְכַרְקָב לְבֵית יְהוּדָה ("Therefore I [God] am like a moth to Ephraim, and like dry rot to the house of Judah,") is translated as και εγω ως ταραχη τω Εφραιμ και ως κεντρον τω οικω Ιουδα ("And I am as confusion to Ephraim, and as a spur to the house of Judah," -- a free translation).

<sup>4</sup>α' and οι ετεροι = βρωστηρ ("moth"); σ' = ευρωσ ("mold, decay"). θ' = ερυσιβη ("rust"); cf. also Micah 7:4 where God in the Greek is compared to a moth or bookworm (σης).

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Targum, page 240; the Septuagint = ככעס so Vollers [op. cit., I, p. 248], or כרעש, so Sebök (both according to Harper, op. cit., p. 273). Nyberg (op. cit., p. 38) considers the Septuagint to have read the root of the Hebrew as שׁשׁ. The Syriac, incorrectly, = "pavor" (Nyberg, loc. cit.).

κεντρον <sup>1</sup> ("spike, spur, or incentive"). This uncertainty is increased in Hosea 13:8 which compares God to an animal in every clause but one. There<sup>2</sup>, the subject is switched in the Greek from God to an animal. This change probably does not reflect a theological motive<sup>3</sup>. Likewise, the translations of the verb,  $\alpha\omega$  ("to roar"), as  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  <sup>4</sup> and  $\omega\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  <sup>5</sup> ("to howl") in Hosea 11:10<sup>6</sup> probably do not represent alterations of an anti-animistic nature. These verbs convey almost exactly the meaning of the Hebrew.

Finally, two very interesting alterations occur in connection with the names of God. These changes are considered here because one of them gives God definitely an animistic description in the Hebrew, namely  $\gamma\iota\tau$  ("Rock"):

#### HABAKKUK 1:12<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>  $\alpha'$ ,  $\sigma'$ ,  $\sigma\iota$   $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\sigma\iota$  =  $\sigma\eta\psi\iota\varsigma$  ("fermentation, decay"). The Septuagint read here either  $\eta\pi\iota$  or  $\eta\pi\iota$  with the meaning of the Aramaic (Vollers [loc. cit.] and Harper [op. cit., p. 273]). The Syriac = leprosy, elephantiasis (so Harper, loc. cit.).

<sup>2</sup> See page 67, footnote 3.

<sup>3</sup> See page 67.

<sup>4</sup>  $\alpha'$  =  $\omega\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  ("to howl, bellow, roar").

<sup>5</sup>  $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\upsilon\chi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  ("to spit, spew"; in aorist, "to roar") in L-<sup>36</sup> - 764; cf. 62 1 I - 86 o.

<sup>6</sup> Likewise in Joel 4(3):16 and Amos 1:2, the Septuagint may soften the concept of Yahweh roaring ( $\alpha\omega$ ) by the translation of  $\alpha\nu\alpha\kappa\rho\alpha\zeta\omega$  ("to cry out") and  $\phi\theta\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("to utter a sound of voice"), respectively.

<sup>7</sup> Rock, as a name of God, occurs only here in the Twelve.

וַיִּצַן לְהוֹכִיחַ יְהוָה<sup>1</sup>

. . . and thou, O Rock,  
has established them for  
chastisement.

και επλασε με του  
ελεγχειν παιδειαν αυτου<sup>2</sup>

. . . and he has formed  
me to chasten with his  
correction.<sup>3</sup>

This change may have arisen from objections to describing God as a Rock -- especially to say that His name is "Rock" --, or the translator may have been offended at the idea of God establishing anyone for purposes of correction. More likely he unintentionally misread<sup>4</sup> his text as וַיִּצַן<sup>5</sup> יְהוָה לְהוֹכִיחַ . If so, his translation naturally follows.

In Joel 1:15, the alteration concerning the name of God (יְהוָה)<sup>6</sup> may not, however, reflect so much a theological bias of the translator as the desire to preserve in the Greek the play on words noticeable in the Hebrew. Thus, the Hebrew, וַיִּצַן וַיִּשְׁמַד (" . . . and as destruction

<sup>1</sup>The Targum omits the וַיִּצַן ; see pages 239f., footnote 2.

<sup>2</sup> α' = και στερεον εις το ελεγχειν εθεμελιωσας αυτον;  
; σ' = κραταιον εις το ελεγχειν εστησας (-σαν) αυτον.

<sup>3</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1106.

<sup>4</sup>Of course, the translator may have possessed a Hebrew text which differed from the Masoretic Text.

<sup>5</sup>The first word may not have contained the second י, and so the root, צַן ("to form, fashion") was easily suggested. Likewise the final word could easily have been mistaken for וַיִּצַן . Cf. Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 180.

<sup>6</sup>This word is inconsistently translated in the Septuagint; perhaps it was a puzzle to the translator (so Dodd, C.H., op. cit., p. 14).

from the Almighty it comes.") which refers to the Day of Yahweh, is translated as και ως ταλαιπωρία εκ ταλαιπωρίας ηξει (" . . . and it will come as trouble upon trouble.")<sup>1</sup>

— — — — —

The animistic comparisons are usually retained. Moreover, since there are no clear examples of an anti-animistic nature, it becomes very doubtful whether this translator had any real anti-animistic bias, especially as the changes in the passages considered above may have arisen either from a different text (or vocalization) or misreading the Hebrew text.

X X X X X

The conclusion must be reached that the grosser anthropomorphisms found in the Hebrew are retained in the Greek either unaltered or with the anthropomorphic feeling and picture remaining in a paraphrase of the Hebrew. This inference agrees with Orlinsky's finding on the Pentateuch and Job<sup>2</sup>. This does not necessarily deny that the Greek translation contains embryonic anti-anthropomorphisms, although it suggests that the Septuagint of the Twelve probably does not contain any anti-anthropomorphisms. This

---

<sup>1</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1081.

<sup>2</sup>" . . . whatever theological beliefs the LXX translators of the Pentateuch and Job held, they did not resort to antianthropomorphic or euphemistic tricks, but reproduced their Hebrew manuscripts faithfully." -- Orlinsky, H.M., "The Septuagint -- Its use in Textual Criticism", The Biblical Archaeologist, 9 (1946), p. 33.

conclusion is corroborated by the fact that the Targum usually supports the Masoretic Text against the Septuagint<sup>1</sup>. Even when the Targum supports the Greek, it translates the Hebrew in a manner which suggests that the Hebrew text of the Septuagint and that of the Targum varied in some respect from the Masoretic Text<sup>2</sup> rather than that a common (or similar) anti-anthropomorphic device was used. In the remaining instances the Targum differed with both the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text.

In several instances the Septuagint may have possessed a different text<sup>3</sup>, misread the text, or vocalized the consonantal text differently.

Up to this point the conclusion must be that the case for anti-anthropomorphism in the Septuagint Book of the Twelve is, at best, the Scottish Verdict of "NOT PROVEN".

---

<sup>1</sup>About three out of four.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 11:3; Jonah 1:4?

<sup>3</sup>Gerleman considers it is not prima facie probable that the variations in the Septuagint are due to the translators but it is probable that their Hebrew text varied from the Masoretic Text (so Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament [Lund: C.W.K. Gleerups, 1948], p. 29), cf. Gehmen, H.S., (op. cit., I Samuel, p. 292), who states that "As we read the footnotes of the Kittel Biblia Hebraica or the observations in the various commentaries, we have to agree with the commentators that in a number of passages the Greek translator used a Hebrew Text different from that of the Masoretes."



## CHAPTER III

### THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT:

#### THE LESSER ANTHROPOMORPHISMS

There are several groups of anthropomorphic expressions which do not convey to the human mind the resemblance of Deity to humanity as clearly as do those discussed in the last chapter. Perhaps the group which conveys the greatest anthropomorphic picture is composed of anthropopathisms, i.e., expressions which attribute to God the emotions of jealousy, love, etc.

Another group describes certain actions of God which more vaguely suggest certain likenesses of God to mankind. Likewise, the ascription to Deity of certain possessions implies that He possesses a form in order that He may profit from possessing such things. Finally, certain stated relationships between God and man are difficult to imagine unless God has a personality and some type of physical form or manifestation.

#### 1. THE ANTI-ANTHROPOPATHISMS OF THE SEPTUAGINT

The tendency to avoid use of anthropopathic language in the Septuagint in connection with God is even less noticeable than the apparent avoidance of the grosser anthropomorphisms. The translator of the Minor Prophets, unlike the translator(s) of the Pentateuch<sup>1</sup> into Greek, apparently is

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Fritsch, op. cit., pp. 17-20.

not disturbed greatly by anthropopathic language and, therefore, usually does not trouble to alter the Hebrew. The ascription of grief, anger, wrath, fear, repentance, et al., to Deity is retained. This literal translation of anthropopathisms is, perhaps, to be expected, for even the Targums<sup>1</sup> are somewhat highly anthropopathic and deny very few human passions to God.

### (1) THE INDIGNATION OF GOD

One of the few possible instances of an anti-anthropopathic alteration is found in connection with the word **אָפַּיִר**. This verb occurs three times (once as a pual participle) and the corresponding noun occurs four times. The basic idea of the root is to "be indignant, have indignation"<sup>2</sup>, and of the noun, "indignation"<sup>3</sup>.

In two passages where this verb, **אָפַּיִר** ("be indignant") occurs, there are alterations which may have resulted from an anti-anthropopathic bias.

#### [1] ZECHARIAH 1:12

אָפַּיִר אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ  
אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ

. . . against which [the  
cities of Judah] thou  
[God] hast had indignation  
these seventy years?

<sup>1</sup>See pages 243ff.

<sup>2</sup>Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 276.

<sup>3</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>4</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See pages 253f.

ας υπερειδες τουτο  
εβδομηκοστον ετος

. . . which thou has over-  
looked these seventy  
years?

This translation of אַתָּה עָרִיד ("thou hast had indignation") by υπερειδες ("thou hast overlooked") probably is not an anti-anthropopathism, although it may be a "softening"<sup>1</sup>.

[2] MALACHI 1:4<sup>2</sup>

וְעַם אֶדוֹם עָרִיד לְפָנַי  
עַל־עַד

. . . the people [Edom]  
with whom the Lord is  
angry forever.

και λαος εφ' ον παρα-  
τεταχται κυριος εως  
αιωνος

. . . and 'A people to  
whom the Lord hath ever  
been opposed'.

This translation is at least as anthropomorphic as the Hebrew to which it corresponds. In fact, the verb παρατασσω ("to set in battle") is probably more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew עָרִיד ("to be indignant"). Therefore,

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Lowe (op. cit., p. 15) who considers this to be an euphemistic translation, and Rignell (op. cit., p. 45), "milder".

<sup>2</sup>The remaining passage in Micah 6:10 has a peculiar translation for the Hebrew clause, אֲדִיכִיָּה וְיִיִּר אֲדִיכִיָּה ("And the scant measure that is abominable?" -- American Jewish Translation), is rendered as και μετρον υβρεως αδικια ; ("And the uprighteous a measure of pride?" -- a literal translation). Certain Septuagint manuscripts (W V, L<sup>2</sup>-711 - 49<sup>2</sup> C - 534 Ach Syh Arab. Cyr<sup>p</sup>. Th. Tht. Thph. Hi<sup>p</sup>) read αδικιας . Probably this change is to make the meaning more intelligible. Taylor (op. cit., p. 143) considers that אֲדִיכִיָּה is translated by αδικιας "because the αδ. is the cause of the curse." See also the Targum, page 254.

<sup>3</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 254.

these two passages may reflect not an anti-anthropopathic tendency but an alteration to prevent the implication that God could be eternally indignant, or for a long period (seventy years). Had an anti-anthropopathic bias been the motive, a different and more consistent type of change would have been expected. It is very questionable whether these translations really would be satisfactory to anyone motivated by anti-anthropopathic zeal<sup>1</sup>.

The passages in which the noun (  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon$  = "indignation") occurs are rendered twice appropriately, once in Hosea 7:16 by  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \alpha\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\nu^2\ \gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$  ("... by reason of the unbridled state of their tongue:") for  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\ \alpha\gamma\epsilon$ <sup>3</sup> ("... because of the insolence of their tongue!") and once in Nahum 1:6 by  $\sigma\omicron\rho\gamma\eta\varsigma^4\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  ("His wrath") for  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ <sup>5</sup> ("His indignation"). In one passage (Zephaniah 3:8) two other Hebrew words (  $\qquad$  = "anger" and  $\qquad$  = "burning"),

---

<sup>1</sup>See page 153.

<sup>2</sup>Aquila's  $\alpha\pi\omicron\ \epsilon\mu\beta\omicron\iota\mu\eta\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  ("from indignation") and Symmachus'  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \epsilon\mu\beta\omicron\iota\mu\eta\sigma\iota\nu$  ("because of indignation") represent literal translations. Theodotion agrees with the Septuagint. The quinta editio (  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \mu\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$  ["fury"] ) represents another literal translation. The Targum (page 255) also translates paraphrastically.

<sup>3</sup>The translation of  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon$  ("indignation") by  $\alpha\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\nu$  may be only an attempt to render the meaning of the Hebrew into idiomatic Greek. This contention is especially weighty if the Septuagint was made primarily for Gentile readers. Cf. in Habakkuk 3:12, the rendering,  $\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\eta$  ("threat, boast").

<sup>4</sup>This word translates  $\qquad$  ("anger") most frequently in the Septuagint.

<sup>5</sup>See page 255.

which are almost synonymous, are found closely associated with **אָפּ** ("indignation"). Here, apparently, the translator felt that there was too much duplication of ideas and, therefore, he did not translate<sup>1</sup> the **אָפּ**<sup>2</sup> ("indignation"). The remaining passage, Habakkuk 3:12, contains **יָרָם-יָרָם אָפּ**<sup>3</sup> ("Thou marchest through the earth in indignation,"<sup>4</sup>) which is rendered as **ἐν ἀπειλῇ**<sup>5</sup> **ὀλιγωσεῖς**<sup>6</sup> **γῆν** ("With a threat (boast)<sup>7</sup> You will bring the earth low."<sup>8</sup>). Since the Greek translation (**ἀπειλή** = "threat") is as anthropomorphic as the Hebrew (**אָפּ** = "indignation"), it is unlikely that

---

<sup>1</sup>Some manuscripts, etc. (11<sup>7</sup>-613, S<sup>ca</sup>(vid.), V, L<sup>1</sup>-613, C<sup>1</sup>-538 - 68 - 239 Syh Arm Eus. Dem. Cypr. (?) Hi.) add **תּוֹרָתוֹ** ("My Wrath"). Cf. the Targum; see page 255.

<sup>2</sup> **אָפּ** **יָרָם** **כָּל** **הַחֵם** **לִפְנֵי** **יְהוָה** ("to pour out upon them my indignation, all the heat of my anger;") = **τοῦ ἐκχεῖν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς πᾶσαν ὀργὴν θυμοῦ μου** ("to pour out all the fury of my wrath on them.").

<sup>3</sup>See page 255.

<sup>4</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>5</sup>This word is found twenty-one times, twelve of which are in III and IV Maccabees. In the remaining nine times, it translates **אָפּ** once, **יָרָם** (**יָרָם**) four times, **אָפּ** once, and **אָפּ** once. Twice the word translated is uncertain. In the Minor Prophets it is found elsewhere only in Zechariah 9:14 **πορεύσεται ἐν σαῶν ἀπειλῇς αὐτοῦ** ("And [God] shall proceed with the tumult of his threatening." -- Bagster's translation) for **יְהוָה** **יָרָם** **לִפְנֵי** ("And [God] will go with whirlwinds of the south." -- American Jewish Translation).

<sup>6</sup>**ὀλιγωσεῖς** ; L<sup>1</sup>-36 (86<sup>txt</sup>) **συμπατησεῖς** ("You will trample underfoot").

<sup>7</sup>**ἀγγειλή** ; et al.

<sup>8</sup>A free translation.



this translation attempts to avoid the anthropopathic description here. The reason for the Greek translation may have arisen from translating  $\gamma\upsilon\gamma\alpha$  ("You march") by  $\text{ολιγωσεις}$ <sup>1</sup> ("You will bring low"). The translator may have misread a  $\gamma$  as a  $\gamma$ , or he may have possessed a different text.

The above examples clearly show the lack of consistency in the method of translation of  $\text{אָפּ}$ . Lowe<sup>2</sup> considers Zechariah 1:12 to be an euphemistic translation, but Malachi 1:4 can hardly be so regarded. If anything, it is a change of an anthropopathism to an anthropomorphism. The motive, however, which produced the alteration may be an anti-heathen bias on the translator's part. Probably Micah 6:10, Habakkuk 3:12, and Hosea 7:16 are due to the requirements of translation, i.e., to render the Hebrew into readily comprehensible Greek. Nahum 1:6 and Zephaniah 3:8 remain anthropopathic in the Septuagint. In one passage  $\text{אָפּ}$  ("indignation") is omitted, and in the other it is translated by a synonym. Therefore, since only one fairly clear instance (Zechariah 1:12) of an anti-anthropopathic softening exists, this example cannot establish conclusively an anti-anthropopathic tendency -- especially since the motive for the change may have been an objection to the duration of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Perhaps this is a denial of motion to God; it is the only occurrence of  $\gamma\upsilon\gamma$  ("march") in the Twelve. See page 318.

<sup>2</sup>Lowe, op. cit., p. 15.

indignation rather than the mere fact that God was indignant.

Likewise, in Nahum 1:2 God is described as a master of wrath ( *אֵל מֵלֵךְ* = "And a master of wrath", i.e., "full of wrath"). This is translated by *μετὰ θυμῶν*<sup>1</sup> ("with wrath") in the Septuagint. The translation of *מֵלֵךְ* ("master") by *μετὰ* ("with") may be a slight softening of an anthropathism, or it may represent an attempt to avoid any possible connection of God with the heathen deity Baal (*בַּעַל*). Even more likely, however, this translation was selected in order to change the idiomatic Hebrew expression into a Greek idiom which conveys essentially the same idea. The last two suggestions are supported by the translations of both Aquila and Symmachus; they translated the phrase as *ἔχων θυμῶν* ("having wrath").

---

Therefore, no conclusive evidence of an anti-anthropathic tendency may be deduced from an examination of passages which describe God as indignant, angry, and the like. Most of these are translated literally in the Greek.

## (2) COMPASSIONATE EXPRESSIONS APPLIED TO DEITY

In Micah 1:8, following two verses in which the first person pronoun refers to God<sup>2</sup>, the prophet continues "On

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum avoids by stating that there is power before Yahweh, see page 252.

<sup>2</sup>The reference is to Samaria in the Septuagint (according to Taylor, op. cit., p. 15).

account of this let me (or I will) wail and howl, go stripped and naked, make a wailing . . ."<sup>1</sup>. Either this was offensive to the translator who considered God to be the speaker, or, more likely, (as Cohen<sup>2</sup>, Smith<sup>3</sup>, et al., think) the translator considered that the speaker was now not God but the prophet. Therefore, he translated the verbs by appropriate third person singular<sup>4</sup> forms for purposes of clarity. That this was the case may be seen, perhaps, in the use of the cohortatives.

Other changes of interest include the translation of ܡܢܐ ("to have compassion") by αγαπαω<sup>5</sup> ("to love") in Zechariah 10:6<sup>6</sup>. This word usually is translated by ελεεω ("to have put on" or "show mercy to") or its synonym, οϊκτειρω<sup>7</sup> ("to pity, have pity [on]"). Another interesting

---

<sup>1</sup>A free translation.

<sup>2</sup>Cohen, op. cit., p. 157.

<sup>3</sup>"This is one of several instances in which the man as patriot bewails most grievously the event which as prophet he is bound to announce." (So Smith [J.M.P.] in Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 38).

<sup>4</sup>Cf. the Targum which translates the forms as third person plurals; see pages 250f.

<sup>5</sup>The translator apparently understood ܡܢܐ to have the meaning of Aramaic ܡܢܐ. Moreover, the translation remains equally anthropopathic and is not very far from the Hebrew picture. The Targum translates literally by ܡܢܐ.

<sup>6</sup> ܡܢܐ ܕܝܢܐܢܐ (" . . . because <sup>g</sup> [God] have compassion on them,") = ܡܢܐ ܕܝܢܐܢܐ (" . . . because I have loved them:").

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Micah 7:19; see also Zechariah 1:16.

change is the translation of  $\text{לִנְחַם}$  ("to spare, have compassion") by  $\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\tau\iota\zeta\omega$ <sup>1</sup> ("to choose") in Malachi 3:17<sup>2</sup>. This choice of  $\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\tau\iota\zeta\omega$  may be an attempt to avoid ascribing compassion to Deity, but it is more likely an attempt to emphasize the close relationship between God and Israel.

Again the evidence is lacking for anti-anthropopathisms which relate to God's compassion.

### (3) THE EMOTIONS OF PLEASURE AND DESIRE ASCRIBED TO DEITY

The verb,  $\text{נָחַם}$  ("to be pleased with, accept, be favorable"), occurs in Hosea 8:13<sup>3</sup>, Amos 5:22<sup>3</sup>, Micah 6:7 and Malachi 1:10,13 where the Septuagint interprets the verb in the sense of accepting favorably<sup>4</sup>. In Haggai 1:8, however, the anthropomorphic coloring of pleasure is fully retained in the Septuagint by the use of  $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\chi\epsilon\omega$  ("to be well pleased, content"). Thus the treatment of this verb cannot be regarded as anti-anthropomorphic, especially since, e.g., in Amos 5:22, the anthropomorphic color of the parallel verb,  $\text{בָּרַךְ}$  ("to look"), is retained fully by the translation,  $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omega$  ("to look upon").

<sup>1</sup>The usual translation is  $\phi\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("to spare"). Aquila so translates here.

<sup>2</sup> $\text{וְאֵנִי לִנְחָמֵם}$  ("And I will spare them. . .") =  $\text{καὶ αἰρεσιω αὐτοὺς}$  ("And I will choose them"). The Targum translates literally.

<sup>3</sup>The Targum usually translates literally, but in these two passages it translates impersonally. See pages 255f.

<sup>4</sup>The Septuagint uses  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\delta\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ .

Another verbal change of interest concerns the translations of  $\text{רָצָה}$  ("to be sweet, pleasing") in Hosea 9:4<sup>1</sup> by  $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\omega$  ("to sweeten") and in Malachi 3:4<sup>2</sup> by  $\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\omega$  ("to be pleasing")<sup>3</sup>. These two Greek verbs ( $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\omega$  and  $\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\omega$ ) literally translate  $\text{רָצָה}$ , but each gives this verb ( $\text{רָצָה}$ ) a slightly different meaning.

The passage in the Septuagint which seems most likely to reflect an anti-anthropopathic bias of the translator, regarding the emotion of desire, is Hosea 10:10<sup>4</sup>:

$\text{בְּאֵימִתִּי}^5$  In my God's desire<sup>6</sup>  
(or) When it is My desire.  
 $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$  <sup>7</sup> I (they) came.

<sup>1</sup>  $\text{וְלֹא יִרְצֶנּוּ-לֵו}$  ("... and they [Israel] shall not please him [God] ...") =  $\text{καὶ οὐχ ἡδυναν αὐτῷ}$  (αι θυσιαὶ αὐτῶν) = "nor offer him sweet incense;". The Targum here = Masoretic Text. See page 256.

<sup>2</sup>  $\text{וְרָצָה לִיהוָה מִנְחָת יְהוּדָה וִירוּשָׁלַם}$  ("Then the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to the Lord ...") =  $\text{καὶ ἁρῆσει τῷ κυρίῳ θυσία Ἰουδα καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ}$  ("... and the sacrifice of Judah and Jerusalem will please the Lord ..."). The Targum here softens. See page 256.

<sup>3</sup> Only two appropriate instances in the Twelve.

<sup>4</sup> Only place in the Twelve where the emotion of desire seemingly is denied to Deity.

<sup>5</sup> The Targum probably here supports the Masoretic Text. It translates  $\text{בְּאֵימִתִּי}$  by  $\text{בְּמִסְרִי}$  ("By My Word"); see pages 208f.

<sup>6</sup> The Revised Standard Version translates "I will come" in the body proper; their footnote s (page 943) states that this is a correction and that the Hebrew reads "in my desire".

<sup>7</sup>  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon(\nu)$  ("He came") - codd. gr. et verss. (> B La<sup>S</sup>) [Ziegler, *op. cit.*, p. 170].



This translation, however, may have resulted from a different or misread Hebrew text. The root of the Hebrew  $\text{יָחַז$  ("in my desire"), is the verb,  $\text{יָחַז$  ("to desire"). The text which the translator had may have read  $\text{יָחַז}$ <sup>1</sup> (=  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$  , "I came"), or else he may have misread his text in this manner. If so, the translation of  $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$  ("I came") would be appropriate for the form,  $\text{יָחַז}$ <sup>2</sup>. These suggestions also are supported by the fact that the Greek translation is still anthropomorphic, although to a lesser degree, perhaps.

Therefore the description of God as possessing the human emotions of pleasure, desire, and the like is retained in the Greek. Even those passages where changes occur are unlikely to be anti-anthropopathic.

#### (4) GOD'S HATRED

Finally, one more concept must be considered, i.e., the idea of God hating.

##### MALACHI 2:16

$\text{כִּי שָׂנֵא אֱלֹהִים$

For he hates<sup>3</sup> [hating]  
divorce,

<sup>1</sup>So Procksch (op. cit., p. 905 footnote); Harper (op. cit., p. 349) says that the Septuagint manuscript A =  $\text{יָחַז}$ . Oort [op. cit., p. 139], Marti [op. cit., p. 82], Dathe, and Oettli (so Harper, op. cit., p. 349), and Robinson, T.H., (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 40) emend to  $\text{יָחַז}$ . Ruben (op. cit., p. 18) considers that Septuagint =  $\text{יָחַז}$ , and Vollers (op. cit., I, p. 242), that the Septuagint omits.

<sup>2</sup>Several commentators (e.g., Scott, op. cit., p. 144) follow the Septuagint in reading  $\text{יָחַז}$ .

<sup>3</sup>Revised Standard Version, footnote j, p. 996.

ἀλλὰ εἰ μισήσας<sup>1</sup>  
ἐξάποστείλης

But if thou having hated  
shalt put away--<sup>2</sup>

Most commentators emend the Hebrew text either to  $\text{אנין}$ <sup>3</sup> ("I hate"<sup>4</sup>) or to  $\text{אנין}$  ("I hate"<sup>4</sup>) and interpret the clause to mean that God hates divorce.

Sellin<sup>5</sup>, moreover, retains the Masoretic Text without emendation. He translates, "Denn es hasst Entlassung 'Jahwe' [/'Wie' sein Gewand mit Gewalttat bedecken.]"<sup>6</sup>. Thus, he also still considers Yahweh<sup>7</sup> to be the subject of the verb, 'to hate'.

The translator of the Septuagint<sup>8</sup>, therefore, probably considered that God was the subject of  $\text{אנין}$  ("to hate") and resorted to an artificial compromise in the translation which reconciled the bold prophetic statement of Malachi with the

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint may represent a slightly different text, such as,  $\text{אנין} [\text{א}] \text{אנין} [\text{א}] \text{אנין}$ . This requires only the addition of a  $\text{א}$  and a  $\text{י}$ . Could the translator have misread  $\text{אנין}$  as  $\text{אנין}$ ?

<sup>2</sup>Bagster (*op. cit.*, p. 1129) renders as "But if thou shouldest hate thy wife and put her away,".

<sup>3</sup>E.g., Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 975, footnote. He emends to  $\text{אנין}$  ("I hate").

<sup>4</sup>So also the Revised Standard Version, "For I hate divorce,".

<sup>5</sup>Sellin, Ernst, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, Zweite Hälfte Nahum - Maleachi (2nd and 3rd edition, Band XII, Sellin, Ernst, editor, Kommentar zum Alten Testament; Leipzig: D. Werner Scholl, 1930), pp. 353-619.

<sup>6</sup>"For Jahwe hates putting away [/'as He does the covering of a garment with violence]."

<sup>7</sup>Sellin (*op. cit.*, p. 605) states: "Subjekt ist natürlich Jahwe,".

<sup>8</sup>The Targum avoids this completely. See page 247.

law found in Deuteronomy 24:1ff; 21:14; 22:13<sup>1</sup>.

If this conclusion is correct, then the translation reflects not an anthropopathic bias but is a softening of Malachi's statement to reconcile it with the Mosaic divorce law<sup>2</sup>. The rendering, in this case, was made on dogmatic grounds. In any case too much can not be inferred from a single example.

X                      X                      X                      X                      X

Therefore out of all the possible alterations which may have been introduced into the Septuagint to avoid describing God in anthropopathic language not one passage exists in which an anti-anthropopathic bias clearly is evident. A few times the translator may have possessed a different text or else misread his text<sup>3</sup>, and in a few passages the change may have been caused by a pro-Israel bias<sup>4</sup>, a desire to protect God's<sup>5</sup> character, etc. In several passages the seeming change has been produced by a sincere attempt to translate the idea of the Hebrew as accurately as possible into Greek<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, the translator at times seems to have

---

<sup>1</sup>Sellin, op. cit., p. 606.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., Malachi 2:16, see page 88. Cf. Hosea 10:10, see page 87; and Micah 1:8 (shift in speakers), see page 84.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., Malachi 3:17, see page 86.

<sup>5</sup>E.g., Zechariah 1:12; Malachi 1:4, see pages 79f.

<sup>6</sup>E.g., Nahum 1:2, see page 84.

translated words in accordance with their later meaning in Hebrew or Aramaic<sup>1</sup> but not in the sense they had in Biblical Hebrew.

## 2. ANTHROPOMORPHIC ACTIONS OF DEITY WHICH ARE ALTERED

There are several actions<sup>2</sup> of Deity which may be considered to describe Deity in anthropomorphic terms. Certain of these actions have undergone some change in the Greek. Here again, however, the evidence is far from conclusive that this is due to an anti-anthropomorphic bias. Certainly, the change in Habakkuk 3:9 from "Thou (God) didst cleave (  $\gamma\rho\alpha\nu$  )<sup>3</sup> the earth with rivers,"<sup>4</sup> to "The land of rivers shall be torn asunder,"<sup>5</sup> (  $\rho\alpha\gamma\eta\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$  )<sup>6</sup> is not necessarily anti-anthropomorphic even though God is no longer portrayed

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Zechariah 10:6, see pages 85f.

<sup>2</sup>The translation of  $\text{לָרַם}$  (hi. = "deliver") by  $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omega$  ("to lift up"), as in Zechariah 11:6, is not restricted to God alone (e.g., in Hosea 2:10(12); Micah 5:7(8); et al.), and, therefore, is not an anti-anthropomorphic softening nor a lexical choice. The translation of  $\text{יָצַו}$  is usually  $\sigma\omega\zeta\omega$  ("to save"), but in Zechariah 8:13 it is  $\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\omega\zeta\omega$  ("to preserve"). In the manuscript W (and Ziegler) on Zechariah 8:7  $\text{יָצַו}$  is translated  $\alpha\nu\alpha\sigma\omega\zeta\omega$  ("to restore"). These may be softenings or may be attempts to translate properly the Hebrew verb in that particular context.

<sup>3</sup>The Targum alters slightly but supports Masoretic Text.

<sup>4</sup>  $\text{וְהָרִוּ תְּבִק־עַמְּרִי}$ .

<sup>5</sup>  $\text{ποταμων ραγησεται γη}$  The translation is Bagster's (*op. cit.*, p. 1108).

<sup>6</sup>Aquila and Symmachus both interpret as the Masoretic Text (  $\sigma\chi\iota\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  = "you split, cleave") as does also the Vulgate and W<sup>c</sup> (  $\rho\eta\chi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  = "you tear apart").

as cleaving, nor does it have to involve a change of the consonantal text. Possibly the translator read  $\gamma\rho\alpha\iota\eta$  (second masculine singular piel imperfect) as a third feminine singular niph'al or pual imperfect -- a difference of vocalization only<sup>1</sup>.

Likewise, in Micah 2:12<sup>2</sup> the change in the Greek translation of συναχθησεται ("will be gathered"), which represents  $\gamma\theta\kappa\kappa$ <sup>3</sup> ("I will gather"), may be understood easily as an anti-anthropomorphism or may be considered as representing a different text<sup>4</sup> and vocalization. This assumption, that the translator read a different text (or else misread the text), is made more probable by the fact that the remaining first person (common) singular verbs are translated without change in person and by the fact that  $\gamma\theta\kappa$ , consistently and correctly, is translated by συναγω<sup>5</sup> else-

<sup>1</sup>A frequent variation in the Septuagint; Horst (Robinson and Horst, *op. cit.*, p. 180) and Stonehouse (*op. cit.*, p. 238) emend following Septuagint, Old Latin, Syriac.

<sup>2</sup> $\gamma\lambda\lambda\ \gamma\theta\kappa\kappa\ \gamma\theta\kappa$  ("I surely will gather all of you, O Jacob,") = συναγομενος συναχθησεται  $\lambda\alpha\omega\beta\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\sigma\iota\upsilon$  ("Jacob with all his sons shall be gathered together."). Here the Targum = the Masoretic Text.

<sup>3</sup>The Hebrew  $\gamma\theta\kappa\kappa$  is translated as συναχθησεται with Jacob as subject.

<sup>4</sup>So Vollers, (*op. cit.*, II, p. 5) =  $\gamma\theta\kappa$ . Rysell<sup>?</sup> (so Smith [J.M.P.] in Smith, Ward, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 67) considered the Septuagint to be a free translation, and Taylor (*op. cit.*, pp. 69f) considered that συναχ. was used for the sake of variety.

<sup>5</sup>In Zephaniah 3:8 the infinite is rendered as  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ .



where (but in Zechariah 14:2 by *επισυναγω*, a cognate form). The verb, *קבץ* ("to gather, collect"), usually is translated by *εισδεχομαι* ("to take into, admit, receive"). In the Septuagint of Micah 2:12, however, *קבץ* is rendered by *εκδεχομαι* ("to take or receive from") and in Joel 4(3):2 and Micah 4:12, by *συναγω* ("to gather"). All these Greek verbs mean almost the same as the Hebrew word and, therefore, probably have been chosen to convey the exact shade of thought desired by the translator.

The verb, *פרש* ("to spread") is not rendered consistently in the Septuagint. Therefore, the reason for the Greek translation in Zechariah 2:10(6) is not obvious:

כי<sup>1</sup> כארבע רוחות השמים  
פרשתי<sup>2</sup> אתכם

. . . for I have spread  
you abroad as the four  
winds of the heavens,

διότι ἐκ τῶν τεσσαρῶν  
ἀνεμῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ  
συναξω ὑμᾶς

. . . for from the four  
winds of heaven I will  
gather you,

In this verse apparently *συναγω*<sup>3</sup> ("to gather") is the Greek rendering of *פרש* ("to spread"). In Hosea

<sup>1</sup>Procksch (*op. cit.*, footnote, p. 959) emends to *קארבע* with the Septuagint.

<sup>2</sup>Kennedy (*op. cit.*, p. 52) emends to *גרשתי* ("I have driven out"). The Targum alters but supports Masoretic Text; cf. pages 268f.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint = *κνσχη* (Wutz, *op. cit.*, p. 231); = *אספחי* (so Marti [*op. cit.*, p. 406], Cheyne [*op. cit.*, p. 182], and Procksch [*op. cit.*, p. 959, footnote]); = *קבצתי* (Wellhausen, so Mitchell in Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 145). Wright (*op. cit.*, p. 539) says that the Septuagint is incorrect.

7:12<sup>1</sup> the same verb is translated by ἐπιβάλλω ("to cast upon"). In the latter passage the verb may have been chosen because of the context. On the other hand the change in the former passage may have arisen from a pro-Israel bias<sup>2</sup> as well as from an anti-anthropomorphic tendency.

The changes, one involving the hiphil of מָנִי ("to show") and the other of מָנִי (hiphil = "to show"), probably do not reflect any real theological bias. The latter verb occurs in Micah 4:2 as וַיִּנָּחֵם ("... that he [God] may teach us . . .").<sup>3</sup> This in the Septuagint becomes καὶ δεῖξουσιν ἡμῖν (= וַיִּנָּחֵם<sup>4</sup> ["... that they may point out to us . . ."]), a reading which involves only the omission or addition of a ך<sup>5</sup> in the Hebrew text -- a very common occurrence. Moreover, if, as Procksch<sup>6</sup> suggests, the

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum = Masoretic Text here; see page 268.

<sup>2</sup>"They seem to have understood pērāstī in a bad sense 'I will scatter'; then, feeling the difficulty of such an expression being made use of to the people on their return from captivity, they deliberately altered the passage . . ." (Lowe, op. cit., p. 26).

<sup>3</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 262.

<sup>4</sup>So Smith, J.M.P. (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 85) and Vollers (op. cit., II, p. 6).

<sup>5</sup>Or a different vocalization.

<sup>6</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 941 footnote); so also Smith (J.M.P.), Wellhausen, Taylor [op. cit., p. 184], Elhorst, Pont, Smith (G.A.), Nowack, Cheyne, Uort [op. cit., p. 145], Marti [op. cit., p. 301], Halévy, Sievers, van Hoonacker, Duham, Haupt, Graetz [op. cit., p. 20] (according to Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 152); cf. Robinson's מָנִי (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 150).

Hebrew text of Micah 7:15, which contains the verb  $\text{הָרָא}$ , originally read  $\text{וְהָרָאֵנִי}$ <sup>1</sup>, then both the Hebrew  $\text{וְהָרָאֵנִי}$ <sup>2</sup> ("... I will show them ...")<sup>3</sup> and the Greek  $\text{οφείσει}$ <sup>4</sup> are understood without difficulty. The Masoretic Text would represent only the alteration of an  $\text{א}$  to an  $\text{ס}$  and the Septuagint of an  $\text{א}$  to a  $\text{נ}$  -- both of which are common alterations. In addition, the translation of  $\text{הָרָא}$  (hiphil) here in the Septuagint is difficult to understand if the variation is an anti-anthropomorphism because the hiphil of  $\text{הָרָא}$  is reproduced literally by  $\text{δεδεικνυμι}$  ("to show") in other passages of the Septuagint, e.g., Amos 7:1,4; Nahum 3:5; et al. The situation is not the same, however, in Hosea 10:12. The Septuagint here departs from its usual practice.

$\text{וְיָרֵאֵנִי}$ <sup>5</sup>  $\text{וְיָרֵאֵנִי}$  . . . until He come and  
 $\text{וְיָרֵאֵנִי}$  teach righteousness to  
 you.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Roorda and Guthe (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 152), and Kautzsch (so Marti, op. cit., p. 301) who vocalize differently.

<sup>2</sup>"... vielleicht ist aber das  $\text{א}$  am Anfang von  $\text{וְיָרֵאֵנִי}$  als das aramäische Aphel-Präfix anzusehen . . . = 'lass ihn sehen'." (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 150). Ewald (so Taylor, op. cit., p. 184) considers this form to be original.

<sup>3</sup>Revised Standard Version, footnote z, p. 971.

<sup>4</sup> $\sigma$  (?), V, O, L<sup>1</sup> (86<sup>txt</sup>) - 407<sup>mg</sup> - 613, C<sup>1</sup> - 239, Ach, Sa, Arm, Th, Tht, Thph, Cypr, Hi read  $\text{δείξω}$  ("I will show") = Masoretic Text.

<sup>5</sup>The Targum apparently read this as  $\text{וְיָרֵאֵנִי}$  (hiphil imperfect third masculine singular of  $\text{וְיָרֵאֵנִי}$ , "to go down",). See pages 270f.

<sup>6</sup>Following Sharpe (op. cit., p. 208) here.

εως του ελθειν γενη-  
ματα δικαιοσυνης  
υμιν

... until the fruits of  
righteousness come for  
[upon] you.

Apparently γενήματα ("fruits") is the translation of וַיְוֹרֶה ("and he teaches"). This may reflect a theological bias to avoid the anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew by avoiding both the motion of God and instruction by Him. On the other hand the translation may depend upon a different or misread Hebrew 'Vorlage'. The letters (ו)ו could be easily read as a ב or פ and the final ה as a .. Thus, the translator could have had either a text which read פורי or פרי, or else he could have misread his text in this manner. Wutz<sup>1</sup> and Nyberg<sup>2</sup>, however, maintain that the Septuagint could not have read וַיְוֹרֶה as פרי. Therefore, the reason for this translation is most uncertain.

One verse in the Hebrew describes God as selling (מכר) people into slavery<sup>3</sup>. In the Septuagint this has been softened slightly to "deliver, hand over" (αποδιδωμι<sup>4</sup>),

<sup>1</sup>Wutz, op. cit., p. 323.

<sup>2</sup>Nyberg (op. cit., p. 80) states, "פרי kann nicht in seinem Text gestanden haben, denn das gibt er mit καρπος wieder." Nyberg considers that the Septuagint read a form of הרה ("to conceive") here.

<sup>3</sup>Joel 4(3):8; אֶת-בְּנֵיכֶם וּמִכְרָתִי ("I [God] will sell your sons. . .") = και αποδωσωμαι τους υιους υμων ("And I will deliver [give over] your sons. . .").

<sup>4</sup>Compare the Targum which softens מכר in the same way in the first half of the verse but translates it literally in the second half where Judah is described as doing the selling. See page 272.



but, since this conveys the same sense as the Hebrew, it cannot definitely be cited as an example of any protective softening<sup>1</sup>.

In Zephaniah 3:15 the change from ". . . he [God] has cast out [נִבָּד<sup>2</sup>] your enemies,"<sup>3</sup> to ". . . he hath redeemed [λελυτρωται = נִבָּד<sup>4</sup>] thee out of the hand [a pro-Israel addition] of thine enemies,"<sup>5</sup> in the Septuagint may be anti-anthropomorphic. It, however, more probably represents a change of נִבָּד and נָדָה<sup>6</sup> or an instance of translating נִבָּד as if it were the pael of נָדָה (Aramaic)<sup>7</sup>. In either case, the translator possibly objected to the favorable reference to the enemies of Israel and, therefore, added a suffix (σου) and a word (χειρος) to alter a seemingly favorable action of God toward the heathen to be applicable to Israel instead.

Another alteration which may be due to a theological bias is the change of person (a common enough change in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Moreover, ἀποδιδωμι is used secularly in the same verse with reference to Judah's selling these people into bondage.

<sup>2</sup>The Targum and Syriac support the Masoretic Text.

<sup>3</sup>נִבָּדָה נִבָּדָה. Procksch (op. cit., p. 954 footnote) emends to נִבָּדָה נִבָּדָה with the Septuagint, Targum, and Syriac.

<sup>4</sup>So Schwalley (op. cit., p. 206). This, however, is not so certain since in Aramaic the pael of נָדָה may mean "to deliver" (so Gerleman, Gillis, Zephania [Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1942], p. 61).

<sup>5</sup>λελυτρωται σε εκ χειρος εχθρων σου.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Schwalley, loc. cit.

<sup>7</sup>Gerleman, op. cit., p. 61.



Septuagint) in Zechariah 9:10 from יִכְרֹת<sup>1</sup> ("I [God] will cut off. . .") to και εξολεθρευσει<sup>2</sup> ("He [the Messiah] will destroy. . ."). This change involves the use of an intermediary to avoid ascribing to God actions which might seem unsuitable to be ascribed to Him. Therefore, this change perhaps is classified more properly as a Messianic alteration. The Septuagint translation may represent, however, a different text, e.g., יִכְרֹת<sup>3</sup> for יִכְרֹת<sup>4</sup>. This same verb (כָּרַת) occurs also in Zechariah 9:6. There יִכְרֹת<sup>5</sup> (" . . . and I will make an end. . .") is softened to και καθελω (" . . . and I will bring down. . .")<sup>6</sup>. In the latter passage the translation may be due to a theological bias or to a different text<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>The Targum and Th.<sup>lem</sup> (εξολεθρευσω) support the Masoretic Text. Cf. Syriac (= יִכְרֹת-- Jansma, op. cit., p. 71).

<sup>2</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 966 footnote) considers the Septuagint to be correct and so emends to יִכְרֹת along with Marti (op. cit., p. 430), Cheyne (op. cit., p. 186); Houbignat, Newcome, Stade, Wellhausen, Nowack, van Hoonacker, Mitchell (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 277); and Horst (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 238).

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Syriac (Jansma, op. cit., p. 71).

<sup>4</sup>See Procksch, op. cit., p. 966 footnote.

<sup>5</sup>Targum: יִכְרֹת. This usually translates חֲסִיָּה (according to Jansma, op. cit., p. 66).

<sup>6</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1121.

<sup>7</sup>Kennedy, (op. cit., p. 139) emends to יִכְרֹת ("bring low"); after the Septuagint?

These seemingly anti-anthropomorphic changes, therefore, are caused just as probably by different (or misread) texts and/or different vocalization, by interpreting the word according to the Aramaic meaning, or by other theological biases. Hence they do not result necessarily from an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

### 3. ALTERATIONS OF PASSAGES WHICH GIVE GOD CERTAIN ANTHROPOMORPHIC POSSESSIONS

Changes which are least likely to be anti-anthropomorphic, or conversely are likely to be anthropomorphic, are those which involve the addition or subtraction of pronominal suffixes to animate and inanimate possessions. This subject is only noted in passing because these alterations are encountered so frequently in passages which cannot have any theological motivation that it would be difficult to establish a definite theological motivation here. Moreover, the Septuagint is just as apt as not to be more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text in these passages.

### 4. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MEN AND GOD WHICH IMPLY PHYSICAL FORM TO DEITY

There are many actions ascribed by man to God and many attitudes of men towards God in the Hebrew which imply He has a physical form. Some of these actions (or attitudes) do not as strongly imply physical form as others, but still they are difficult for the human mind to conceive as occurring

if God has no form. An example occurs in Hosea 12:1(11:12):

וַיְהוּדָה עַד רַד עִם-אֵל

. . . but Judah still  
roams [wanders rest-  
lessly] with God,<sup>1</sup>

νυν ἐγγων αὐτοὺς  
ὁ θεός

Now God had acknowledged  
them,<sup>2</sup>

This translation hardly can be regarded as being less anthropomorphic than the Hebrew, and, therefore, we must conclude that the difference between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint is due to the latter having a different text which read: <sup>3</sup> יָדַע עִם אֵל <sup>4</sup> עָנָה ("Now God knows them,").

# (1) ACTIONS DIRECTED AGAINST GOD

Hosea 7:14<sup>5</sup> is the only passage in the Twelve where Israel is said to rebel against God. Here יִסְרוּ בִי<sup>6</sup> either is omitted<sup>7</sup> in the Septuagint, or else the translator has

<sup>1</sup>Following the Revised Standard Version, footnote g, p. 944.

<sup>2</sup>The Revised Standard Version essentially follows the Septuagint here, ". . . but Judah is still known by God,".

<sup>3</sup>So Procksch (op. cit., p. 907, footnote) and Vollers (op. cit., I, p. 256). Harper (op. cit., p. 374) reads [ה]נָה <sup>4</sup> יָדַע עִם אֵל (cf. Nyberg [op. cit., p. 91]; Brown, Driver and Briggs [op. cit., p. 923], and Scholz [so Harper, op. cit., p. 374]); cf. Loftman (so Harper, loc. cit.) and Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 44).

<sup>4</sup>Scott (op. cit., p. 147) considers the Septuagint to have read עָנָה עַד <sup>5</sup>נָה; so also Procksch (loc. cit.).

<sup>5</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 290.

<sup>6</sup>". . . they rebel against me."; cf. the Septuagint <sup>7</sup>ἐπαιδεύθησαν ἐν ἐμοί ("They were instructed by Me.") in Hosea 7:15.

<sup>7</sup>So the Arabic and the Septuagint (De-Rossi, op. cit., III, p. 176).

misread<sup>1</sup> his text. He may have avoided translating this clause either because he objected to the anthropomorphic implications or because he wished to avoid the statement that Israel could ever rebel against his God<sup>2</sup>. Most probably, however, he either misread his text or possessed one differing from the Masoretic Text.

Moreover, the implication that Israel is against God is avoided by the Septuagint in Hosea 13:9.

שחתך ישראל כִּי<sup>3</sup>  
כִּי בָעֲזָרִי<sup>4</sup>

It is thy destruction, O  
Israel, That thou are  
against Me, against thy  
help.<sup>5</sup>

τη διαφθορα σου  
ισραηλ τις βοηθησει<sup>7</sup>

In thy destruction, O  
Israel, who can give  
succour?

<sup>1</sup>Or else, more likely, he read כִּי יִשְׁחַתֵּנִי ("And they were chastised by Me") and regarded כִּי יִשְׁחַתֵּנִי ("I chastised") of the next verse as a doublet which he deleted (so also Prochs, *op. cit.*, p. 902 footnote). See page 45. Cf. Malachi 2:8; 3:7 where the basic idea is retained.

<sup>2</sup>I.e., this omission may have arisen from a pro-Israel bias.

<sup>3</sup>The Targum avoids, see pages 291f.

<sup>4</sup>One manuscript omits (see Kennicott, *op. cit.*, p. 257 and De-Rossi, *op. cit.*, III, p. 181).

<sup>5</sup>So the American Jewish Translation. The Revised Standard Version translates, "I will destroy you, O Israel; who can help you?", following in part the Syriac and Greek translations.

<sup>6</sup>L-49, 26, 198, 233<sup>7</sup>, 534 Bo Cyr. ThtP and Thph read διασπορα for διαφθορα. These manuscripts, etc., make a more vivid allusion to the historical event of Israel's captivity than do the other Greek manuscripts.

<sup>7</sup>V 11-86 91<sup>cb</sup> Co Syh<sup>mg</sup> Aeth Arab Arm Th. and Tht. add σοι. The original manuscript very possibly may have contained this word.

The Masoretic Text itself is difficult as it stands. Although the Septuagint avoids both the anthropomorphic implications and the objectionable idea that Israel would be against Yahweh, the translator easily may have read a different text, e.g., בַּשָּׁמַיִם יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי יַעֲזֹבֵהוּ.

Likewise מַעֲבֵד ("to rebel, transgress") usually is translated adequately by ασεβειν<sup>2</sup> ("to act profanely, sin against"). In Amos 4:4, however, מַעֲבֵד occurs twice<sup>3</sup>. The first time it is rendered by ανομειν<sup>3</sup> ("to act lawlessly"); the second time, by ασεβειν. The translation, ανομειν may be an attempt to soften the idea of rebellion, but it also may be caused by the desire to avoid repetition of the same word in the same verse. If the latter is the reason, then ανομειν may have been considered to be a synonym of ασεβειν. In certain translations and one codex<sup>4</sup> of Hosea

---

<sup>1</sup>So Oort [*op. cit.*, p. 140], Graetz [*op. cit.*, p. 14], Valetton, Guthe, Smith (G.A.), Nowack (so Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 392), Vollers (*op. cit.*, I, p. 258), and Nyberg (*op. cit.*, p. 102); cf. Wutz (*op. cit.*, p. 369) who says the Septuagint = בַּשָּׁמַיִם יִשְׂרָאֵל with Procksch's emendation (*op. cit.*, p. 909, footnote). The Syriac = בַּשָּׁמַיִם יִשְׂרָאֵל (Nyberg, *op. cit.*, p. 102).

<sup>2</sup>The translators, having ignored the etymological meaning of מַעֲבֵד "... have found a felicitous rendering for the idea." (Dodd, C.H., *op. cit.*, p. 77).

<sup>3</sup>W (vid), Ziegler; cf. B-V 1L<sup>2</sup> - 613 C<sup>1</sup> - 68 - 239; these manuscripts retain ασεβειν.

<sup>4</sup>In 49 and the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.



8:1, however, the translation of  $\text{נָּשָׂא}$  as  $\alpha\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon\omega$  ("to set aside, disregard") may represent a softening of the idea of rebelling against God. The context suggests the possibility of a pro-Israel bias on the part of the translator.

The translation of the verb  $\text{נָּשָׂא}$  ("to be treacherous"), when it describes man's relation to God, presents a problem. It is translated in both non-theological and theological passages by  $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\omega$ <sup>1</sup> ("to leave behind, forsake") in Hosea 5:7; Jonah 2:9; Malachi 2:10, 11, 14, 15, and 16. Therefore, the occurrence of  $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\omega$  ("to forsake") for  $\text{נָּשָׂא}$  ("to be treacherous") in the theological passages (in Hosea 5:7 and possibly in Malachi 2:11 and 16) cannot be regarded as a softening arising because of a theological bias<sup>2</sup> unless it can be established that the translator regarded the occurrences in Malachi 2:10, 14 and 15 as having theological application. Moreover, this is not the entire problem. In the remaining two<sup>3</sup> verses in the Twelve in which  $\text{נָּשָׂא}$  occurs, the translator uses the verb,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\rho\omicron\nu\epsilon\omega$  ("to think slightly of, despise"), for  $\text{נָּשָׂא}$  in both theological and non-theological passages. This verb ( $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\rho\omicron\nu\epsilon\omega$ ) does not translate consistently any particular Hebrew verb,

---

<sup>1</sup>In the Twelve, however,  $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\pi\omega$  ("to leave behind, forsake") regularly translates  $\text{נָּשָׂא}$  ("to leave, forsake, loose").

<sup>2</sup>Anti-anthropomorphic or pro-Israel.

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 6:7; Habakkuk 1:13; cf. also Habakkuk 2:5.

although it would be an adequate equivalent of  $\text{נִזַּל}$ <sup>1</sup> ("to despise"). The simplest explanation is that the Septuagint, in these last two passages, was translated from a text in which either  $\text{נִזַּל}$  ("to despise") occurred or  $\text{נִזַּל}$  was misread as  $\text{נִזַּל}$ . A translator having a defective text easily could read a  $\text{ז}$  and  $\text{ל}$ , respectively, as a  $\text{נ}$  and  $\text{ז}$ . Another possibility would be that Alexandrian Judaism considered the act of despising God as less offensive to the idea of God than the act of treachery towards Him<sup>2</sup> -- or at least less anthropomorphic -- but, if this is the case, why was Hosea 5:7 (and Malachi 2:11,16) not similarly treated?

Another verb whose translation in the Septuagint is very interesting is  $\text{גָּבַע}$  ("to rob?"<sup>3</sup>). This verb occurs some four times in Malachi 3:8f and invariably is translated by  $\text{πτερνίζω}$ <sup>4</sup> ("to strike with the heel, trip"<sup>5</sup>). The Hebrew reads:

הִיבָע אָדָם מִלֶּחֶם כִּי אֵת  
קִבְעִים וְאִסְרוֹת בֶּטֶן  
קִבְעוֹנוֹךְ... וְאֵת אֵת קִבְעִים

Will a man rob God? Yet  
you are robbing me. But you  
say, 'How are we robbing  
thee?'. . . for you are  
robbing me;

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Proverbs 19:16 where Septuagint translates  $\text{נִזַּל}$  by  $\text{καταφρονέω}$ .

<sup>2</sup>One would think the opposite to be more probable.

<sup>3</sup>Brown, Driver and Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 867.

<sup>4</sup> $\alpha', \sigma', \theta'$  =  $\text{αποστερέω}$  ("to rob, despoil"), interpreting  $\text{גָּבַע}$  in the later Jewish meaning (Ziegler, J., "Beiträge zum griechischen Dodekapropheten", *Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Nr. 10 (1943), p. 379).

<sup>5</sup>Liddel, Scott, Jones, *op. cit.*, II, p. 1546.

<sup>6</sup>The Vulgate supports Masoretic Text and the Syraic = the Septuagint (according to Mitchell, Smith, Beyer, *op. cit.*, p. 74).

εἰ πτερνίζει<sup>1</sup> ἄνθρωπος θεόν  
 διότι υμεῖς πτερνίζετε<sup>2</sup>  
 καὶ εἰπείτε Ἐν τίνι ἐπτερνί-  
 καμεν<sup>3</sup> σε...καὶ ἐμε υμεῖς  
 πτερνίζετε<sup>4</sup>

Will a man strike God?  
 Because you are striking  
 Me! And you say 'In what  
 have we stricken you . . .  
 And Me you are striking!'<sup>5</sup>

This rendering of the Septuagint is unusual and may reflect the difficulty of deciding how to translate this verb, *γνρ*, the meaning of which is uncertain. In later Hebrew it means "to rob", and this is the meaning found in the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion who all render it by *αποστερεω* <sup>6</sup> ("to rob, despoil"). These translations are anthropomorphic, and, therefore, the Septuagint may represent: (1) the original meaning of *γνρ*, (2) a softening of the Masoretic Text, or (3) a different<sup>7</sup> or misread text. Most likely, the Septuagint possessed a different 'Vorlage'

---

<sup>1</sup>Procksch (*op. cit.*, p. 975, footnote) emends with Septuagint to *απυρνει*. So also Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti [*op. cit.*, p. 475], Sievers, Isopescul, Duhm, Riessler, (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 74); and Horst (Robinson and Horst, *op. cit.*, p. 264).

<sup>2</sup>Procksch (*loc. cit.*) emends with Septuagint to *απυρνει*.

<sup>3</sup>Procksch (*loc. cit.*) emends with Septuagint to *απυρνει*.

<sup>4</sup>Procksch (*loc. cit.*) emends with Septuagint to *απυρνει*.

<sup>5</sup>A free translation.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. footnote 4, page 104.

<sup>7</sup>According to Brown, Driver, and Briggs (*op. cit.*, p. 867) the Septuagint read here *απυρ* circumvent (so also Wellhausen according to Brown, Driver and Briggs, *loc. cit.*).

in which a form of עָקַב<sup>1</sup> ("to assail insidiously, circumvent, overreach") was found.

Equally dubious is the Septuagint's translation of Malachi 3:13:

חֲזָקוּ עָלַי דְּבָרֵיכֶם<sup>2</sup>

Your words have been  
stout against me,

Εβαρυνάτε ἐπ' ἐμὲ  
τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν

You have brought heavy  
accusations against me,

This translation of חֲזָק ("to be strong") by βαρυνω ("to be heavy, weigh down") may be paraphrastic rather than a softening of more offensive language.

Possibly the command of God in Malachi 3:10 to try (test) Him was considered to be too offensive, and, therefore, the translator softened its anthropomorphic description:

וּבְחִנּוּנִי נָא בְּזֹאת

. . . and thereby put me  
to the test,

ἐπισκεψάσθε<sup>3</sup> δὴ  
ἐν τούτῳ

Turn [pay attention] now  
in this respect,

The conclusion that this translation is an anti-anthropomorphism is by no means certain since the same verb (בָּחַן) occurs in Malachi 3:15 where the wicked were described

<sup>1</sup>Cf. footnotes 1, 2, 3, 4, page 105. Koehler, L., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1952), II, p. 820, considers עָקַב to mean "deceive". He considers that, in Malachi, עָקַב is substituted for עָקַב, probably as an "intended metathesis . . . to avoid assonance to עָקַב" (*loc. cit.*).

<sup>2</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text, see page 293.

<sup>3</sup>α', θ', Cyr. X. 909 = δοκιμάσατε ("assay, test"); cf. Cyr. X. 909; σ' = πειράσατε ("attempt, endeavor, try").

as trying (or testing) God:

בָּמָה בָּחֲנוּ אֱלֹהִים<sup>1</sup>

. . . but when they put  
God to the test. . .

καὶ ἀντεστήσαν<sup>2</sup> θεῷ

Though they opposed God;

This translation of בָּחֲנוּ ("to test") by ἀντεστήσαντι ("to resist") retains the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew, although it may soften slightly the concept of the original text. Therefore, these translations may have been motivated by a desire to avoid unsuitable expressions in connection with the concept of God.

## (2) THE VISIBLE APPEARANCE OF GOD

In Zechariah 9:14 the statement occurs that God can be seen, presumably by man.

וַיֵּהָרָא עֲלֵיהֶם יְהוָה<sup>3</sup>

Then the Lord will  
appear over them,<sup>4</sup>

καὶ κυριὸς ἔσται<sup>5</sup> ἐπ'  
αὐτοὺς

Let but the Lord be  
against them. . .<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the use in Zechariah 13:9, see pages 49f. Both the non-theological reference and the one to Deity are translated by the verb δοκιμαζω ("assay, test") in Zechariah 13:9 which is very appropriate there.

<sup>2</sup>α', ἐδοκιμασαν ("they tested"); σ', θ', ἐπειράσαν ("they tempted").

<sup>3</sup>The Targum supports Masoretic Text yet avoids the anthropomorphism (see pages 279f.); cf. the Syraic.

<sup>4</sup>I.e., "The Lord shall fight for them." (Kimchi -- so M'Caul, op. cit., p. 90).

<sup>5</sup>A "solecism" (Jansma, op. cit., p. 76); perhaps a text with הָיָה (Vollers [K.A., Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner Erste Hälfte, Berlin: Mayer und Mueller, 1880, p. 63] and Jansma -- so Jansma, op. cit., p. 76).

<sup>6</sup>Or "And the Lord will be over them . . ."



This translation conveys much the same idea as the Hebrew, but the suggestion readily presents itself that the translator was seeking to avoid stating that God could be seen. This motive for the translation, however, appears less certain when it is noted that elsewhere in the Twelve the statements that God can be seen always are translated literally<sup>1</sup>. Therefore, more probably, either the translator had a 'Vorlage' which lacked the  $\text{הָיָה}$ <sup>2</sup> ("will be seen") or else he misread<sup>3</sup> the  $\text{אֵל}$  in his text as  $\text{יָה}$ <sup>4</sup>.

### (3) SEEKING REFUGE IN GOD

The explanation of the Greek translation of Nahum 1:7 is most uncertain. The interpretation of  $\text{בְּיָהוָה}$ <sup>5</sup> ("... those who take refuge in him,") as  $\text{τοὺς εὐλαβούμενους αὐτοῦ}$  ("... them who reverence him") is understood easily. It is probably not a theological change<sup>6</sup>. Instead

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Habakkuk 3:10 where  $\text{וַיִּרְאוּ הָהָרִים}$  ("The mountains saw thee, and writhed;") is translated as  $\text{ὁπνῶνται σε ὠδινῆσουσι λαοί}$  ("the nations shall see thee and be in pain," -- Bagster, *op. cit.*, p. 1108).

<sup>2</sup>His 'Vorlage' may have had a form of  $\text{יָה}$  instead of  $\text{הָיָה}$ .

<sup>3</sup>Or his text may have been defective.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Vollers (*op. cit.*, p. 76) and Jansma (*loc. cit.*).

<sup>5</sup>The Targum avoids the anthropomorphism yet does not support the Septuagint.

<sup>6</sup>Of course, the translator may have interpreted the idea of seeking refuge in God to be equivalent to reverencing or worshipping God.

the Septuagint may have read  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$ <sup>1</sup> ("kind, pious") in place of  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$ . This suggestion involves only an assumption that the Septuagint had a defective  $\text{י}$  in their text or that the  $\text{י}$  was misread as a  $\text{י}$ <sup>2</sup>.

If the translator read  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$  in Nahum 1:7b, that may have influenced his interpretation of the first half of the verse, "The Lord is good, a stronghold [ $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$ ]<sup>3</sup> in the day of trouble;"<sup>4</sup>. This portion he translated as, "The Lord is kind to them who wait for [support --  $\text{τοὺς}$

$\text{υπομενουσιν}$ ] him in a day of distress;"<sup>5</sup>. His 'Vorlage' here may have contained (or have been misread as)  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$ <sup>6</sup> or some similar form; this, however, is not too likely<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>One manuscript reads  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$  (De-Rossi, op. cit., III, p. 202).

<sup>2</sup>Halдар (Studies in the Book of Nahum [Uppsala: A-B Lundequistska Bokhandelen, 1947], p. 26) considers the root  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$  may have existed somewhere with the meaning "to be fearful".

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the Targum which supports Septuagint. Bicknell, Gunkel, Wellhausen, Smith (G.A.), Davidson (A.B.), Gray, Orelli, Nowack, Halévy, Marti, Driver (S.R.), Haupt, Staerk, Kautzsch, Kent, Smith (J.M.P.), (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 300) emend following the Septuagint to  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$ ; so also Procksch (op. cit., p. 942, footnote), Horst (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 156). Cf. Wutz, op. cit., p. 271.

<sup>4</sup>  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי בְּיָמֵינוּ לְיָמֵינוּ}$ .

<sup>5</sup>  $\text{Χρηστος κυριος τοις υπομενουσιν αυτον εν ημερα θλιψεως}$ .

<sup>6</sup>With the meaning of abiding, enduring, persisting, etc.

<sup>7</sup>The Syriac has considered  $\text{יְיָ־יִשׁׁי}$  as a hiphil infinitive while the Vulgate has translated it as a hiphil participle. Halдар considers that no emendation is necessary since every version supports the Hebrew consonantal text (Halдар, op. cit., p. 25).

The last word (  $\text{יָצָא}$  ), however, occurs also in Joel 3(4):16<sup>1</sup>. Here the Septuagint renders it as  $\epsilon\nu\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota$  ("to strengthen, confirm"). The translator apparently considered it to be a hiphil participle from  $\text{יָצָא}$  ("to be strong")<sup>2</sup>. The other word does not occur in Joel 3(4):16, although a derivative  $\text{נָחַם}$  is found. Perhaps the Septuagint considered this word (  $\text{נָחַם}$  ) here to be derived from  $\text{נָחַם}$ .<sup>3</sup> If so, the Septuagint may represent a slight pro-Israel strengthening. Nevertheless, the translation of Nahum 1:7 in the Septuagint is puzzling if the differences from the Masoretic Text are considered to have arisen because of a theological bias.

#### (4) BEING STRONG IN GOD

This concept seldom appears in the Twelve. In one passage (Zechariah 12:5) the Septuagint seems to have softened or avoided the concept;

אֲמַנָה לִי יְשׁוּבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם  
בִּיהוָה צְבָאוֹת אֱלֹהֵיהֶם

The inhabitants of  
Jerusalem have strength  
through the Lord of hosts,  
their God. *reading יִשְׁמְרוּ?*

Ἐυρησόμεν<sup>4</sup> αὐτοῖς τοὺς  
κατοικοῦντας Ἱερουσαλὴμ  
ἐν κυρίῳ παντοκράτορι θεῷ  
αὐτῶν

We will find those for us  
who inhabit Jerusalem by  
the Lord Almighty their  
God.

<sup>1</sup>Only two appropriate occurrences.

<sup>2</sup>Cf.  $\text{יָצָא}$  (Vollers, *op. cit.*, II, p. 15), Bewer (Smith, Ward, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 144), et al.).

<sup>3</sup> $\text{פָּרַח}$  ("[the Lord] will spare").

<sup>4</sup> $\alpha$  ' =  $\text{καρτερήσεν}$ .

Probably the translator was not avoiding an anthropomorphism, but, more likely, he read  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha$  as a form of the verb  $\alpha\pi\alpha$ , perhaps  $\alpha\pi\alpha\alpha$ <sup>1</sup>, which he translated as a plural because of the  $\chi\iota\lambda\iota\alpha\rho\chi\iota$ <sup>2</sup>.

Some of the passages considered in this section have been translated literally or paraphrastically. In other passages the Septuagint translator may have read a different text (or misread his text). Occasionally a theological bias may be indicated as, for example, a pro-Israel bias.

Therefore, the relationships existing between God and man which are portrayed in the Hebrew, and which thus imply an anthropomorphic nature to God, usually are carried literally over into the Greek. Moreover, even when changes occur in the Septuagint, an anti-anthropomorphic bias upon the part of the translator cannot be established beyond reasonable doubt.

X X X X X

These lesser anthropomorphisms which have been considered in this chapter, therefore, were not altered by the translator any more than were the grosser anthropomorphisms

---

<sup>1</sup>So Wright, C.H.H., op. cit., p. 585. This form occurs in three manuscripts (loc. cit.; Lowe, op. cit., p. 109; De-Rossi, III, op. cit., p. 218; Kennicott, op. cit., II, p. 299).

<sup>2</sup>So Jansma, op. cit., p. 114; Wright, loc. cit.; Lowe, loc. cit.

of Chapter II. There is no passage which clearly shows that its translation must have resulted from an anti-anthropomorphic tendency. The fact that the Targum (usually with one or more other versions) is based on the Masoretic Text (or one very similar to it) increases the possibility that reasons other than a theological bias caused changes in translation.

This does not mean that some theological bias, either an anti-anthropomorphic bias or some other theological belief, may not have consciously or unconsciously influenced these translations. It does mean, however, that such theological beliefs have not yet been definitely proven to have been the primary motive for changes made. If the translator did have these beliefs, and if he also had a defectively written text, such differences of translation naturally would be expected.



## CHAPTER IV

### FURTHER ALTERATIONS CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF GOD IN THE SEPTUAGINT

In the preceding two chapters the discussion has been limited to passages which, in the Hebrew, may be classified as the more obvious anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions. Certain other expressions, statements, and passages, which are anthropomorphic in the broader sense, also occur. These passages involve certain other concepts of Deity and, therefore, have been reserved for discussion here. Some translations of the passages which present these other concepts of Deity may reveal some of the translator's theological beliefs concerning Deity.

#### 1. THE OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD

The belief that God is everywhere present is, of course, anti-anthropomorphic. This conception of Deity insists that God cannot be confined to a given place and that He does not need to move about since He is already present everywhere. Therefore, if the translator of the Greek Book of the Twelve believed that God was omnipresent, the influence of this belief, consciously or otherwise, may have been reflected in his translation of those passages which, in the Hebrew, describe God as moving about or being in a certain place. Of course, the absence of any change which can be traced to the influence of this theological

concept does not prove that the translator did not believe in the omnipresence of God.

# (1) THE DENIAL OF MOTION TO DEITY

Usually the Septuagint follows the Masoretic Text in permitting God to move about freely. In a few places, however, the Greek translation substantially differs from the Hebrew.

## [1] JONAH 2:7(6)

יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי לַיְלָה<sup>1</sup>

Yet thou didst bring up  
my life from the Pit,

καὶ ἀναβητῶ<sup>2</sup> φθορὰ<sup>3</sup>  
ζωῆς μου

. . . let my soul now,  
corrupt as it is, ascend,<sup>4</sup>

The לַיְלָה ("ascend") may be vocalized so that it may have either God as the subject or אֱלֹהֵי ("destruction, pit"). Apparently the Masoretes vocalized it one way, and the Septuagint vocalized it another way. Hence, this translation may not have resulted from the translator's belief in the omnipresence of God. Possibly the translator was puzzled by the

<sup>1</sup>The Targum rests upon a text similar to the Masoretic Text.

<sup>2</sup>This verb ( ἀναβαίνω ) is the usual Greek equivalent for הָלַךְ (hi.) except in Amos 8:10 which reads καὶ ἀναβίβω ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ὀσφύν σακκὸν ("And I will bring sackcloth to go on every loin") for בָּשָׂה כָּל-לֵבָבִי וְהָעֵלִיתִי ("I will bring sackcloth upon all loins,"). The Greek here literally translates the Hebrew.

<sup>3</sup>Or ἐκ φθορᾶς with S<sup>C</sup> - V 86<sup>mg</sup>, W<sup>C</sup>, Sa, 407, oi λ', σ', θ', α' = ἐκ διαφθορᾶς.

<sup>4</sup>Or "And let the destruction of my life ascend."

fact that Jonah was praising God for having raised him up already from the pit, i.e., from the inside of the fish, while he was still inside of the fish. This difficulty could be avoided easily by vocalizing *byn* as a jussive and by taking *nnw* ("destruction") to be its subject. Then Jonah's statement would be an appropriate petition for him to be making at that time. Against this suggestion is the translation of the rest of the prayer, but it is as reasonable to accept this suggestion as it is to assume that the translation was made to avoid the concept that God moves about -- especially as this is an isolated example of such a change in connection with this verb.<sup>1</sup> An alternate possibility is that the Septuagint and Masoretic Text preserve two traditional vocalizations of this passage without any other signification.

[2] JOEL 4(3):11

שמה הנחת יהודה  
גבוריה

Bring down thy warriors,  
O Lord.

ο πρᾶς εἰτω μαχητης <sup>2</sup>

Let the man of peace be-  
come a soldier.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This verb *αυαβαινω* ("ascend") is the usual Greek translation of the hiphil form of *הלך* ("to go up"). The only exception is in Amos 8:10 where the causative Greek verb corresponding to *αυαβαινω* is used. See page 114, footnote 2.

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint = *הנח יהודה גבוריה* (Procksch, op. cit., p. 915, footnotes).

<sup>3</sup>or "Let the soft (or faint) -hearted become a mighty one (or warrior)." Cf. Wade, op. cit., p. 116.

The reason for this translation is uncertain.

Apparently, the translator considered  $\text{אֵלֹהִים}$  to be an imperfect,  $\text{אֵלֹהִים}^1$ , and connected the first word ( $\text{אֵלֹהִים}$ )<sup>2</sup> with the preceding word. He also seemingly omitted the suffix of the final word and regarded  $\text{אֵלֹהִים}^3$  ("bring down") as a substantive<sup>4</sup> with the article ( $\text{אֵלֹהִים}$ ) prefixed.

The principal problem in this passage concerns  $\text{אֵלֹהִים}$  ("bring down") since the verb  $\text{אָנַח}$  ("go down") does not occur elsewhere in the hiphil form. Therefore, several scholars (e.g., Graetz<sup>5</sup>, Scholz, Credner<sup>6</sup>) have followed the Targum, Syriac, and Vulgate<sup>7</sup> in deriving  $\text{אֵלֹהִים}$  from  $\text{אָנַח}$  ("to be dismayed, shattered"). Others (e.g., Marti<sup>8</sup>, Sievers, Duhm<sup>9</sup>, Mowinckel) describe it as "a gloss" or as "meaningless"<sup>10</sup>. Still others consider that the Septuagint

---

<sup>1</sup>This amounts only to the reading of a  $\text{אֵלֹהִים}$  (defective?) as a  $\text{אֵלֹהִים}$ .

<sup>2</sup>Apparently the Revised Standard Version does this also.

<sup>3</sup>Cheyne (op. cit., p. 131) emends to  $\text{אֵלֹהִים}$  ("Lead thou, O Yahweh . . .").

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Wünsche (Wünsche, A.: Die Weissagungen des Propheten Joel (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, R. Reisland, 1872), p. 290).

<sup>5</sup>Graetz, op. cit., p. 15.

<sup>6</sup>Bewer states that all three do as stated above (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139).

<sup>7</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>8</sup>Loc. cit.; cf. Marti, op. cit., p. 140. See also Kapelrud, A. S., Joel Studies (Uppsala: A. - B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1948), p. 161.

<sup>9</sup>So Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139.

<sup>10</sup>So Kapelrud, op. cit., p. 161.

had a different text, e.g., הַנּוֹחַ יִהְיֶה גִבּוֹר<sup>1</sup> ("let the peaceful one become a hero!"<sup>2</sup>). Even though this suggestion does not require so many emendations, yet it necessitates a change in every word. Moreover, it also requires that נֹחַ ("to rest") must have meaning different from its usual one of 'rest'.<sup>3</sup>

Perhaps the best suggestion is made by G. R. Driver<sup>4</sup> who considers that the Septuagint represents the original text<sup>5</sup>, i.e., הַנּוֹחַ יִהְיֶה כְּגִבּוֹר ("the timid one will be as the mighty one"). This emendation necessitates only three changes in the text itself -- the omission of ו, the shift of the final ך to an initial כ<sup>6</sup> in the last word, and the

---

<sup>1</sup>According to Kapelrud (loc. cit.), so Beyer, Sellin, Robinson, and Mowinckel. Yet Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 68) actually suggests הַנּוֹחַ יִהְיֶה גִבּוֹר, and Beyer (Smith, Ward, Beyer, op. cit., p. 139) considers the Septuagint to have read הַנּוֹחַ יִהְיֶה כְּגִבּוֹר [Beyer (loc. cit.), moreover, emends to הַנּוֹחַ]. Procksch (op. cit., p. 915, footnote) essentially agrees with this. He suggests הַנּוֹחַ for הַנּוֹחַ. Vollers (op. cit., II, p. 15) agrees with Beyer and takes the הַנּוֹחַ to have been read with an Aramaic meaning.

<sup>2</sup>Following Beyer (op. cit., pp. 134, 135, 139) and Kapelrud (op. cit., p. 161).

<sup>3</sup>Consequently Kapelrud (op. cit., p. 162) and Marti (op. cit., p. 140) consider the Hebrew הַנּוֹחַ to be a hiphil imperative of נָחַ, an Aramaic word meaning 'to go down' (i.e. = Biblical Hebrew יָרַד). Hence Kapelrud (op. cit., p. 161) still considers the Masoretic Text to be correct.

<sup>4</sup>Driver, op. cit., p. 401.

<sup>5</sup>Loc. cit.; cf. Sellin (see Kapelrud, op. cit., p. 161), Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 68), etc.

<sup>6</sup>The Septuagint does not indicate this preposition (כ = as).



common change of י and י. The מִן is then considered as a niph'al of מָנָה.<sup>1</sup> This text would thus have some support from the Targum and Syriac, both of which also derive their roots from מָנָה.<sup>2</sup> The sense then would be ". . . he who is frightened," i.e., a timid one. From this standpoint the Septuagint would not represent a theological alteration made by the translator.

[3] HOSEA 6:3

כַּשֵּׁר כְּבֹרֵךְ יוֹמָא

. . . his going forth is  
sure as the dawn;

ὡς ὀρθρὸν ἐσθιμον  
εὐρησομεν αὐτον

. . . sure as the morning  
we shall find him.

Although this translation may reflect a desire to avoid the ascription of motion to Deity, two facts make this assumption unlikely: (1) the other occurrences of the root מָנָה (" . . . to go forth. . .") in appropriate theological passages are translated literally<sup>3</sup>; and (2) the translation itself is anthropomorphic and also would be offensive to a translator with an anti-anthropomorphic bias. A more probable suggestion is that the translator possessed a different text or else misread his text. Procksch<sup>4</sup> suggests that perhaps

---

<sup>1</sup>Only elsewhere found in Malachi 2:5 (so Driver, loc. cit.)

<sup>2</sup>ε' = ὅτι ὡς ὀρθρὸς βεβαία ἡ ἐπιφάνεια αὐτοῦ  
("Because His manifestation is certain as the dawn. . .").

<sup>3</sup>See Introduction, pages xdxix. for a list of such passages.

<sup>4</sup>Procksch, op. cit., p. 900, footnote.

the Masoretic Text should be emended to: <sup>1</sup>נִמְצָאנוּ כֵן <sup>2</sup>נִשְׁחַדְדוּ כֵן  
 ("As we seek eagerly, so shall we be found. . ."). A more  
 probable text for the 'Vorlage' of the Septuagint would be  
 נִמְצָאנוּ בַּבֹּקֶר (" . . . as the dawn is certain, we  
 will find Him,"). This text involves only the doubling of  
 the final ך of the נִמְצָאנוּ, the transposition of the first ך  
 in the last word, and the reading of a ך as a ך. Consequently,  
 this text would be an instance of haplography-dittography.  
 Moreover, this text easily could be read either as it is given  
 in the Masoretic Text or as translated in the Septuagint --  
 especially if the consonants were written together without  
 any word divisions. Therefore, although the reason for the  
 translation may not be established definitely, a different  
 'Vorlage' or a misread text constitutes a more probable  
 reason for the Septuagint's rendering than does the  
 assumption of a theological bias.

[4] HABBAKKUK 3:12

בְּזַעַם תַּצְעַד-אֶרֶץ

Thou didst bestride the  
 earth in fury,

<sup>1</sup>So Oettli (according to Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 281).  
 An emendation which is closer to the Septuagint is נִמְצָאנוּ  
 ("We will find Him. . .") as Harper (*loc. cit.*), Giesebrecht,  
 Wellhausen, Valetton, Smith (G.A.), Nowack, Marti [*op. cit.*,  
 p. 54], and Oort [*op. cit.*, p. 137], emend (so Harper, *loc.*  
*cit.*). Marti (*op. cit.*, p. 54) believes that the Septuagint  
 read either נִמְצָאנוּ (as Procksch) or נִמְצָאנוּ (as  
 Giesebrecht, *et al.*).

<sup>2</sup>So Harper (*op. cit.*, p. 281), Giesebrecht, Marti [*op.*  
*cit.*, p. 54], Wellhausen, Smend, Valetton, Nowack, Smith (G.A.),  
 Oort [*loc. cit.*] (so Harper, *loc. cit.*), and Marti (*op. cit.*,  
 p. 54).

εν απειλη ολιγωσεις<sup>1</sup>  
 γην

With a threat thou canst  
 diminish a land,<sup>2</sup>

Although this passage is the most likely example of a translation which denies motion to Deity, the translation may depend just as easily upon a misread text<sup>3</sup>, a defectively written text<sup>4</sup>, or a different text.

[5] ZECHARIAH 3:9

•נָשַׁבִּי<sup>5</sup> . . . and I will remove  
 . . .

ψηλαφησω . . . and I will feel .  
 . . .

This rendering may be a softening of the Hebrew, or the translator may have considered •נָשַׁבִּי to be from the root נָשַׁב<sup>6</sup> ("to grope after, touch, examine"). If the latter was the case (and it essentially requires a different

---

<sup>1</sup>W\* αγγελιης ; συμπατησεις ("You will trample under-foot") in L<sup>1</sup> - 36 (86<sup>txt</sup>) Tht.

<sup>2</sup>or "With a threat you will bring the earth low."

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint may have read the γ as a ρ which would also agree with the consonants implied by the Syriac, Vulgate (so Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. 396f), L<sup>1</sup> - 36 (86<sup>txt</sup>) Tht, and two Hebrew manuscripts (cf. Driver, *loc. cit.*); so also Stonehouse, *op. cit.*, p. 243; cf. Reinke.

<sup>4</sup>See page 82.

<sup>5</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.

<sup>6</sup>So Mitchell (Mitchell, Smith, Bower, *op. cit.*, p. 161), Stekhoven (Stekhoven, J.K. Schuurmans, *De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1897], p. 105), Lowe (*op. cit.*, p. 38), and Rignell (*op. cit.*, p. 130). Graetz (*op. cit.*, p. 23) and Kennedy (*op. cit.*, p. 22) emend to •נִשְׁבִּי ("and I will wipe out").

vocalization), then the translator rendered the Hebrew accurately according to his understanding.

---

These apparent alterations in translation which may deny (or soften) the portrayal of God as moving from place to place are not likely to be even embryonic denials of motion to God. The probabilities are just as great that they have resulted from some other causes; e.g., some may have arisen from a different or misread (defective) text. Therefore, the Septuagint translator cannot be said to have believed so strongly in the omnipresence of God that he was compelled, as were the Targums, to deny motion to Deity.

## (2) THE DENIAL OF PLACE TO GOD

### [1] ZECHARIAH 2:15(11)

The numerous instances in the Masoretic Text which represent God as being in the midst of Israel, in His house, in the Temple, and having a particular place of His own, etc., are retained in the Greek translation with one possible exception:

וְשִׁכְנָתִי בְּחִבּוֹכְךָ <sup>1</sup>	And I will dwell in the midst of you,
---	--

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text but is anti-anthropomorphic. See page 306, footnote 2. "T zeigt, dass er MT richtig verstanden hat, auch wenn die Übersetzung frei ist: וְשִׁכְנָתִי בְּחִבּוֹכְךָ [And I will place My Shekinah in your midst], und ich will meine Schechina in deiner Mitte wohnen lassen." (Rignell, op. cit., p. 95).

καὶ κατασκηνώσου-  
σιν ἐν μέσῳ σου<sup>1</sup>

. . . and [they, i.e., the  
heathen] dwell in the  
midst of thee;<sup>2</sup>

This rendering is strongly pro-heathen and may translate accurately the original text<sup>3</sup>, or a variant one, to which some scribal group objected<sup>4</sup> and altered to our present Masoretic Text. The translation, of course, indicates a text involving only the change of a *•nto* *•*, unless a defectively written *•* gave rise to the *•n*. It is highly improbable that any Jew of the period in which the Septuagint text was written ever would have made such an unnecessary alteration as was required to yield the Greek text.

[2] HABAKKUK 3:6

---

<sup>1</sup>Iust. Dial. 1151 (non 1193) Eus. dem. p. 246.273 (non. p. 58.394) Cyr. X 877 Th. IV 977<sup>p</sup> read κατασκηνώσω ("I will dwell") = Masoretic Text.

<sup>2</sup>"Auch hier kann man nicht voraussetzen, dass LXX eine andere Lesart gehabt habe als MT. Stattdessen dürfte sich LXX als ein Versuch erklären, den Vers flüssiger zu machen, indem er das Verb den Völkern gelten lässt. So wird auch die Wiederholung von *וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ בְּתוֹכָךְ* aus V. 14 vermieden. *וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ* ist ganz gewiss als ein traditioneller Terminus für die Gegenwart Jahves bei seinem Volk aufzufassen. Dass LXX das nicht bemerkt hat, verdient Beachtung zur Charakteristik dieser Übersetzung. S liest weiterhin 3. Pers . . . und er wird wohnen, aber hier handelt es sich um Jahve. *V et habito*. (Rignell, *op. cit.*, p. 95).

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Procksch (*op. cit.*, p. 960, footnote), says, "1 prb *וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ* c G." Cf. Marti (*op. cit.*, p. 407) and Lowe (*op. cit.*, p. 29) who also consider that the Septuagint read *וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ*.

<sup>4</sup>Perhaps they were influenced by the *וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ בְּתוֹכָךְ* ("And I will dwell in your midst. . .") of the preceding verse.



The concept of the Lord as standing<sup>1</sup> usually is translated literally, e.g.:

יָמַד וַיִּדְבֹּק יָמַד	He stood and measured the earth;
ἑστή και ἐσαλευθῆ <sup>2</sup> ἡ γῆ	He stood and the earth was shaken:

This passage, however, may be understood differently. Bagster's translation of the Septuagint considers the ἡ γῆ ("the earth") to be the subject of both verbs and translates, accordingly, as "The earth . . . and trembled."<sup>3</sup> Moreover, certain Septuagint manuscripts<sup>4</sup> translate the יָמַד ("He stood") as ἑστησαν ("they stood"). Hence, there may have been an attempt in this passage to avoid portraying Deity as standing, but the possibility is remote. In Amos 7:7, however, the Septuagint's translation may be anti-anthropomorphic:

וַיֵּשֶׁב יְהוָה מִיְּמֵי	Behold, the Lord was standing . . .
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἑστηκώς	. . . and lo! he was standing . . .

Here the Septuagint avoids the anthropomorphism of the Masoretic Text by not translating יְהוָה<sup>5</sup> ("the Lord"). Certain Greek manuscripts translate יְהוָה ("the Lord") by

---

<sup>1</sup>See pages 47f concerning יָבֹד ("to visit").

<sup>2</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 949, footnote) emends to יָבֹד ("and shook") following the Septuagint.

<sup>3</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1108.

<sup>4</sup>So W\* - 410 Cant. P.

<sup>5</sup>So Lühr (Harper, op. cit., p. 165).

ανηρ<sup>1</sup> ("man, one"). Hirsch<sup>2</sup> considers that the Septuagint's translation of 'אִישׁ is "... due to the influence of the similar form in vs. 1.4<sup>3</sup> and 8<sup>1</sup>, and perhaps also to a desire to avoid the anthropomorphisms of ..."<sup>2</sup> the Masoretic Text. Cripps<sup>3</sup> considers the Septuagint to be preferable, since the picture is that of a workman. In Amos 9:1, however, the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew is retained.

[3] ZECHARIAH 9:8

וְהִנֵּיתִי לְבֵיתִי סֹנֵה<sup>4</sup>

Then I will encamp at  
my house as a guard,<sup>5</sup>

καὶ υποστήσομαι<sup>6</sup> τῷ  
οἴκῳ μου ἀνάστημα<sup>7</sup>

And I will set up a  
defence [bulwark] for  
my house,<sup>8</sup>

Although this translation of υποστημι ("I will

<sup>1</sup>So rel. (W Or. III 214 Or. lat VIII 304); cf. Zechariah 1:8; 2:5(1).

<sup>2</sup>Harper (loc. cit.).

<sup>3</sup>Cripps, op. cit., p. 224; cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 924, footnote.

<sup>4</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 306.

<sup>5</sup>The American Jewish Translation is: "And I will encamp about My House against the Army."

<sup>6</sup>This verb, υποστημι ("to set up", etc.) is used to translate three Hebrew verbs: (1) יָנַח (piel = "to await, wait"), נָחַם ("to stand"), and אָרַם ("to arise"). On the other hand נָחַח ("to encamp") is translated by eight other Greek verbs, including παρατάσσω ("to set oneself in battle"). See Jansma, op. cit., p. 69.

<sup>7</sup>Syriac = "And I will cause a commander . . . to encamp about my house." (Wright, op. cit., p. 569).

<sup>8</sup>So Bagster, op. cit., p. 1121.

station") for *והניתי* ("I will encamp") may be a softening of the Hebrew, it also may suggest that the translator had a different text or misread his text, e.g., *והניתי* for *והניתי*.  
 Alternatively, he may have understood the Hebrew to mean that an army was going to be sent against the Temple. This idea may have been both offensive to him and seemingly out of harmony with the context. Hence his translation may have been an "emendation" which would give the meaning of the "original" text. This suggestion is supported by the translation of *נצב* ("guard, army") as *αναστημα* ("building, structure; height") since this could explain why he vocalized<sup>1</sup> these consonants differently than the Masoretic Text.

[4] ZECHARIAH 2:17(13)

כי נעור ממעון קדש

. . . for he has roused  
 himself from his holy  
 dwelling.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint and Syriac (so Mitchell, in Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 272) apparently vocalized *נצב* ("a guard") differently from the Masoretic Text, perhaps to mean a "column" (so Lowe, *op. cit.*, p. 82; Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 272; *et al.*). Jansma, however, points out that its vocalization is translated in the Septuagint by other Greek words (see Jansma, *op. cit.*, p. 69; cf. footnote 24). He (*loc. cit.*) apparently considers that the Septuagint here translates the Masoretic Text. In any case Mitchell (*op. cit.*, p. 272), Büttcher, Oort, Köhler, Bredenkamp, Stade, Smith (G.A.), Nowack (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, *loc. cit.*), Marti (*op. cit.*, p. 429), *et al.* consider a vocalization which differs both from the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint to be preferable.

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps the Septuagint avoids or softens the concept that God has a place of His own in Micah 6:6 and Amos 9:6. In Micah 6:6 the Septuagint makes the reference to be to the most High God instead of to the God who is "on high". In Amos 9:6 God builds "his ascent" instead of "his chambers".

<sup>1</sup>διότι ἐξεγγεῖται ἐκ  
νεφελῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ

. . . for he is risen up  
from his holy clouds.

This translation scarcely can be an attempt to avoid describing Deity as being confined to some place or places, although the concept may have been slightly softened. More likely the rendering of 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 ("dwelling") by νεφελῶν ("clouds") represents a different<sup>2</sup>, a misread, or a defective text in which 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 ("clouds") was read (stood) for 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 ("dwelling").

[5] ZECHARIAH 9:1

𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤐𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤕

And in Damascus shall be his  
resting-place. . .<sup>4</sup>

καὶ Δαμασκού θυσία<sup>5</sup>  
αὐτοῦ

. . . and Damascus is his  
sacrifice,

<sup>1</sup>𐤓' = κατοικησεως ("dwelling, habitation").

<sup>2</sup>Apparently the Septuagint read 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 (Lowe [op. cit., p. 30], Wutz [op. cit., p. 224], Rignell [op. cit., p. 98]) or 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 (Mitchell, in Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, [op. cit., p. 147]). Rignell (op. cit., p. 98) continues "Die Fehlliesung, denn um etwas anderes dürfte es sich nicht handeln, ist auf Grund der Ähnlichkeit der Buchstaben leicht zu erklären. Möglicherweise schwebte dem Übersetzer die Wolkensäule der Wüstenwanderung vor. Es verdient jedoch hervorgehoben zu werden, dass LXX eventuell nicht falsch gelesen hat, wenn es ihm klar gewesen ist, dass der Ausdruck 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 zur traditionellen Terminologie der Wüstenzeit gehört." Against Rignell is the fact that the Septuagint elsewhere seems to understand 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 correctly (so Lowe, op. cit., p. 30).

<sup>3</sup>The Targum (see page 307) translates a text similar to the Masoretic Text.

<sup>4</sup>American Jewish Translation. The Revised Standard Version translates, "The word of the Lord . . . and will rest upon Damascus."

<sup>5</sup>α', 147<sup>c</sup>, 198, 534, Cyr. read ἀναπαυσις = Masoretic Text.

Since the translation of מנוחו ("His resting place") as θυσια αυτου ("his sacrifice") requires only a change of vocalization<sup>1</sup>, a translator who was prejudiced against the heathen nations and/or one who wished to stress the doctrine of God's omnipresence<sup>2</sup> might easily read an unvocalized text differently than in accordance with the tradition preserved in the Masoretic vocalization. Either explanation is questionable because the idea of Damascus being God's sacrifice would be at least as anthropomorphic as the Masoretic Text and still would exalt the heathen.

[6] MICAH 2:13

וַיִּהְיֶה בְּרֹאשׁוֹ

. . . the Lord at their head.

ο δε κυριος ηγησεται αυτων<sup>4</sup>

. . . and the Lord will be their leader,

This translation is still anthropomorphic and conveys essentially the same concept as the Hebrew. Consequently,

---

<sup>1</sup>So Wutz (*op. cit.*, p. 321), Mitchell, Smith, Beyer (*op. cit.*, p. 270); *Two Codices*, the Syriac and Arabic (Davidson, *op. cit.*, p. 135). Cf. 2 Samuel 14:17; Psalms 132:8,11 (cf. Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 566). This is "a serious but natural error," (Mitchell, Smith, Beyer, *op. cit.*, p. 270).

<sup>2</sup>"The LXX, render here θυσια αυτου . This rendering may possibly be an interpretation like that of the Targum." (Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 566).

<sup>3</sup>The Targum avoids by using Memra; see page 316.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Marti's statement (*op. cit.*, p. 277), ". . . er ist ihr könig." This refers to the preceding clause. If this statement is true, then the Septuagint here interprets and paraphrases the Hebrew.



the translator probably was not attempting to avoid the implication that Deity could be confined to space.

[7] HOSEA 5:3

יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא-חָסָה מִפָּנַי

. . . and Israel is not  
hid from me;

και Ισραηλ ουκ  
απεστίν<sup>1</sup> απ εμου

. . . when Israel did not  
withdraw from me.

In this last passage the concept of being hidden<sup>2</sup> from God is involved. This concept is opposed to the theological belief that Deity is omniscient and omnipresent. The concept implies the anthropomorphic ascription of eyes to Deity. Moreover, in the other pertinent passages, this verb is translated literally. Hence, the translation of יִחְסֶה ("is hidden") by απεστίν ("be away from, withdrawn") probably does not arise from a theological bias.

[8] MICAH 3:4

וְהִסְתִּיר אֶת-פָּנָיו מֵהֶם  
בְּהַהֲמָתָם

. . . he will hide his  
face from them at that  
time,

και αποστρεψει<sup>3</sup> το  
προσωπον αυτου απ  
αυτων εν τω κυριω  
εκεινω και εγω

. . . but [he] will turn  
away his face from them at  
that time,

<sup>1</sup>So also θ'; BC 22<sup>c</sup> - 11 - 86 - 410 - 764 c-239 26'  
La<sup>w</sup> Cyr.<sup>p</sup> Hi., = απεστη ("(he) did remove"); Q<sup>mgb</sup> 46'  
87' Thph. = απεστησα ("I removed"); Ach. = latuit = M.T.;  
α' = επεκαλυφθη ("(he) is obscured"); σ' = ελαθεν  
[- θεσαν ] ("he did escape notice").

<sup>2</sup>See pages 59f.

<sup>3</sup>σ' = αποκρυψει ("he hid").

The translation of  $\text{וַיִּתְּחַבֵּא}$  ("he will hide") by  $\text{καὶ ἀποστρέψει}$  ("but [he] will turn away") avoids the anthropomorphism of the Masoretic Text. Taylor considers that the Syriac and Septuagint made this translation in order to avoid the anthropomorphism<sup>1</sup>. Perhaps Taylor is correct, but the Septuagint accurately translates this verb ( $\text{חָבַא}$ ) by  $\text{κρυπτω}$  ("to hide") in Hosea 13:14, by  $\text{καταδυω}$  ("to go down, sink, set", then "to slink away, lie hid"<sup>2</sup>) in Amos 9:3b<sup>3</sup>, and by  $\text{σχεπαζω}$  ("to cover, shelter") in Zephaniah 2:3. The variety in the verbs selected in the Septuagint probably is due to the translator's exegesis of these passages.

Micah 3:4 states that God will separate Himself from certain people. Hence, he selected an appropriate verb,  $\text{ἀποστρέφω}$ . Zephaniah 2:3, on the other hand, indicates a desire for certain people to obtain protection in the day of Yahweh's anger; the translator's selection of  $\text{σχεπαζω}$  clarifies this fact.

In Amos 9:3b, however, the selection of  $\text{καταδυω}$  probably arises from the selection of  $\text{εγκρυπτω}$  to translate  $\text{מָחַב}$  in the earlier part of the verse. The selection of  $\text{κρυπτω}$  in Hosea 13:14 is a natural one.

---

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, op. cit., pp. 79f.

<sup>2</sup>Liddel and Scott, op. cit., II, p. 880.

<sup>3</sup>In Amos 9:3a the verb  $\text{מָחַב}$  is translated by  $\text{εγκρυπτω}$ .

Several passages whose Greek translations avoid stating that Deity may be found in a particular place(s), cannot be shown positively, to be a denial of place to Deity. Each of these translations may have resulted from other causes, e.g., one translation may reflect a liberal, universalistic outlook on the part of the Septuagint translator or an alteration made in the Masoretic Text because of a pro-Israel bias. Moreover in Zechariah 2:15(11) the translator may have possessed a different text (or one which he misread). The other passages also do not establish definitely that the translator sought to avoid limiting Deity to a single place. In two passages (Micah 3:4 and Amos 7:7) the translation may have been made in order to avoid implying that God was not omnipresent.

## 2. THE OMNISCIENCE OF GOD

This concept of Deity assumes that God cannot have a mind which has limitations like the minds of men. A belief in the omniscience of God would result in certain alterations of the Masoretic Text. Therefore, such a belief may have produced the translations found in several passages in the Twelve.

### (1) JONAH 1:6

קום קרא אל-אלהיך  
אולי יתעשה האלהים  
לנו ולא נאבד

Arise, call upon your  
god! Perhaps the god will  
give a thought to us, that  
we do not perish.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.

αναστα επικαλου τον θεον  
σου οπως διασωση<sup>1</sup> ο θεος  
ημας και μη απολαμεθα

Arise and call on thy  
God, that thy God may  
save us, and that we may  
not perish.

The selection of διασωση ("may save") for *nyyn* ("will give a thought") may indicate that the translator considered that the Hebrew suggested that God was not omniscient, *i.e.*, that He was not aware always of what was happening to one of his servants<sup>2</sup>. The Hebrew text also may have implied to the translator that God was capricious like the heathen deities -- a thought highly offensive! Alternatively, the translator, influenced by the context, may have translated the Hebrew freely rather than literally. The Greek rendering gives the reason why God should be thinking of the men, *i.e.*, in order that He might deliver them out of their peril.

(2) HOSEA 8:4

•nyyn nyyn<sup>3</sup>

. . . but without my  
knowledge.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint = *y'yn* (so Vollers [*op. cit.*, II, p. 19], Beyer [in Mitchell, Smith, Beyer, *op. cit.*, p. 34]), the Syriac (so Beyer, *loc. cit.*), and the Arabic.

<sup>2</sup>Or, in other words, God was the possessor of a mind with limited capacity.

<sup>3</sup>This is the only place in the Twelve where this statement occurs.

καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώρισαν μοι<sup>1</sup>

. . . but they did not  
make it known to me:<sup>2</sup>

Although the Greek translation gives the essential meaning of the Hebrew Text, the thought has been softened in that God now no longer declares that something exists outside His knowledge. Moreover, the translator may have interpreted the Hebrew passage to mean, not that anything existed which God did not know, but only that the situation was without God's knowledge in the sense that Israel had established princes without first consulting God<sup>3</sup>. If so, the Greek translation avoids the implication of the Hebrew that God's knowledge was imperfect and, at the same time, carries the essential thought over into the Greek language. Since this is almost certainly the case, the translation here indicates a theological bias even though it accurately renders the Hebrew.

### (3) HOSEA 13:5

יָדַעְתִּי יְיָ

It was I who knew you

. . .

---

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint and Syriac may represent only a change of pointing (so Nyberg, *op. cit.*, p. 62). Vollers (*op. cit.*, I, p. 251) considers the Septuagint to be a free translation. The Targum avoids the difficulties in another manner (see page 236).

<sup>2</sup>Bagster, *op. cit.*, p. 1075.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Pell's translation, ". . . and did not consult me;".



ἐγὼ ἐποιμαίνον σε <sup>1</sup>

It was I who fed thee

...

This rendering is more anthropomorphic than the original. Probably this is an instance of an original anthropomorphism<sup>3</sup> being preserved in the Septuagint<sup>4</sup> rather than an indication that the translator was influenced by any theological bias.

(4) AMOS 8:7

אם-אשכח לנצח כל-עממיהם

Surely I will never forget any of their deeds.

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint = רעיתי according to the Syriac, Procksch (op. cit., p. 908, footnote), Sebök, Wellhausen, Graetz [op. cit., p. 14], Guthe, Loftman, Smith (G.A.), Marti [op. cit., p. 101], Harper (so Harper, op. cit., p. 392), Drake (op. cit., p. 171), and Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 50); cf. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 102), "[Septuagint, Syriac] רעיתי, was sicher wegen der Paronomasie mit מרעיתם."

<sup>2</sup>The Targum may be a softened version of the Septuagint.

<sup>3</sup>See page 151.

<sup>4</sup>Drake (op. cit., p. 171) suggests that the Septuagint and Targum read רעיתי. . . though their renderings would both be free translations of the word in the text and expressive of the same metaphor. For the care of the shepherd may be as well expressed by רוע in Hebrew as by γινώσκειν in Greek; see John x.10, ". . . Most scholars follow the Septuagint here, e.g., Drake (loc. cit.), Sebök, Harper, Wellhausen, Graetz, Loftman, Smith (G.A.), Marti (so Harper, op. cit., p. 392), et al. Scott (op. cit., pp. 149f) considers that the Septuagint read רעיתי, the dropping of the initial yodh being explained as a doubling of the final yodh of the preceeding word. Scott considers the Septuagint reading is to be preferred to the Masoretic Text ". . . because (1) It explains the stress laid upon the privations of the wilderness. (2) The choice of God (רוע) took place not in the wilderness but in Egypt. (3) The word 'pastures' in the next verse is from the root רעה."

Εἰ ἐπιλησθήσεται εἰς  
νίκος<sup>1</sup> πάντα τὰ ἔργα  
υμῶν

. . . that none of these  
works of yours shall ever  
be forgotten.

The translation avoids the idea that God could forget, i.e., the implication that God is not omniscient, and at the same time it retained the essential meaning of the Hebrew. The Greek verb, ἐπιλησθήσεται ("will be forgotten"), corresponds to the Hebrew verbal form, נָשַׁח . This form requires that a **3** be substituted for an **8** . In connection with this passage, Hosea 4:6 should be considered:

נָשַׁח נַפְשִׁי

I also will forget your  
children.

καὶ ἐπιλησώμαι<sup>2</sup>  
τέκνων σου

I also will forget<sup>3</sup> thy  
children.

In this second passage the middle form of the verb may mean "to neglect"<sup>4</sup> and, consequently, the Septuagint may mean, "I also will neglect your children". This meaning is appropriate to the context, i.e., "And as you have neglected the law of your God, even so I will forget your children."<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, the question arises as to why, if Amos

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum supports the Septuagint here. See page 324.

<sup>2</sup>This verb in the active means, "to cause to forget"; in the middle it means, "to forget (willfully or otherwise), to escape note, leave disregarded, neglect", etc. . . .

<sup>3</sup>Or neglect.

<sup>4</sup>See footnote 2, page 134.

<sup>5</sup>The Targum, "I will drive out", see page 324.

8:7 is an example of a translational alteration which reflects a theological bias, the translator did not render Hosea 4:6 as, "Your children also will be forgotten", instead of using the ambiguous future middle form of the verb. Because of the difference in the treatment of these two passages in the Septuagint, the conclusion cannot be definitely reached that the translation of Amos 8:7 reflects a theological bias.

(5) AMOS 4:13

This passage states that God declares His thoughts (  $\text{יגד-הו}$  ) to mankind. The Septuagint interprets the words as  $\text{τον χριστον αυτου}$  <sup>1</sup> ("His Christ") which corresponds to  $\text{יג(·)וד}^2$  ("His Messiah"). There are several possible explanations for the differences between the Greek translation and the Hebrew: (1) that the Septuagint alters the Hebrew to avoid the implication that God is limited in knowledge, (2) that the Septuagint reflects a pro-Christian alteration, (3) that the Masoretic Text reflects an anti-Christian alteration, or (4) that the Septuagint translator possessed a different text<sup>3</sup> or else misread his (defective?) text.

---

<sup>1</sup>  $\alpha'$  =  $\text{ομιλια αυτου}$  ("His instruction")  $\sigma'$  =  $\text{το φωνημα αυτου}$  ("His utterance");  $\theta'$  =  $\text{τον λογον αυτου}$  ("His Word");  $\epsilon'$  =  $\text{την αδολεσχίαν αυτου}$  ("His prating").

<sup>2</sup>So Harper, op. cit., p. 103; see page 366.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint requires only the deletion of a  $\eta$  and the interchange of  $\eta$  and  $\nu$ .

The alterations of these passages, in which the translation seemingly excludes any possible limitation of God's knowledge, also may have arisen from other motives, from other texts, from misread texts, or the like. Therefore, not one of them may be accepted as an absolutely certain example of a theological change, especially when the numerous instances are considered in the Septuagint which faithfully reproduce the Hebrew concepts of God as being able to forget, able to remember, and the like -- concepts which limit God's mental capacity.

### 3. THE UNCHANGEABLENESS OF GOD

The suggestion that God was changeable undoubtedly was very offensive to the Hebrew people, just as it is to Christians of all ages. Earlier, when Jonah 1:6<sup>1</sup> was discussed, the possibility was mentioned that this verse may have been offensive because of its implication that God might be fickle and capricious. Translations of several other passages in the Septuagint of the Twelve may indicate that the translator wished to protect his concept of a constant, unchangeable Deity<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>See pages 130f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Micah 2:7 where האמור ("Do I change," -- American Jewish Translation) is translated by ο λεγων ("who saith"). See also the Targum (page 323). The meaning of the text is very uncertain. Most commentators translate האמור as being from the verb אמר ("to say") as the Septuagint, e.g., "Should this be said," -- Revised Standard Version.

## (1) JONAH 3:2

וְכַתְּבָהּ לְךָ מִסְמָרִים  
וְכַתְּבָהּ לְךָ

. . . the message that I  
tell [am speaking now to]  
you.

κατα το κηρυγμα το  
εμπροσθεν ο εγω ελα-  
λησα προς σε <sup>2</sup>

. . . according to the  
former proclamation which  
I spoke to thee.

The Hebrew here could be interpreted as meaning that God told Jonah to proclaim to Ninevah the message that He then was speaking to him -- perhaps a message different from the one Jonah originally, in 1:2, had been instructed to deliver. If the two messages were different, the implication would be that God was changeable. In a translation which Gentiles might read, that conception of Deity would be intolerable! It must be recalled that the Hebrew perfect usually is translated in the Septuagint as an aorist. In spite of this, however, the fact that the translators added εμπροσθεν ("the former") makes probable the assumption that he deliberately selected this translation to avoid any offensive suggestions.

Likewise, the translation of מַה־בְּרָרָה ("what is sure") as

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.

<sup>2</sup>"da der Prophet noch einmal den Auftrag erhält, nach Ninive zu gehen, Gottes Ratschluss zu verkünden, ohne dass Näheres angegeben wird, worin dieser besteht, setzt LXX hinzu . . . Jona habe nach dem früheren Auftrage zu verkünden, was mit Ninive geschehen soll." (Treitel, "Wert und Bedeutung der Septuaginta zu den 12 kleinen Propheten", Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums,



πιστα ("faithful") in Hosea 5:9 may have been made in order to emphasize God's faithfulness and unchangeableness.

A change which might have been expected, however, does not occur. The verb  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\iota\omega$  ("to repent, be compassionate") is rendered consistently by an appropriate Greek verb, μετανοεω ("repent")<sup>1</sup>. This Greek verb means, "change one's mind" -- a concept present in the idea of repentance. Therefore, if the above alterations were due to offense at any implied suggestion that God was changeable, why did the translator not alter the passages which state that God repents?

#### IMPUTATION

#### 4. THE IMPLICATION OF DIVINITY TO A CREATED BEING

This concept could not be tolerated, even in so exalted a family as the house of David.

##### (1) ZECHARIAH 12:8

וְבֵית דָּוִיד כְּאַלְהִים

. . . and the house of David shall be like God,

ο δε οίκος Δαυιδ ως  
οίκος θεου<sup>2</sup>

. . . and the house of David like the house of God --

This translation softens<sup>3</sup> the statement of the Hebrew by the addition of the second οίκος ("house") before the

<sup>1</sup>The only exception occurs when  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\iota\omega$  means "to be compassionate". In this instance, the Septuagint renders by ελεεω, e.g., Zechariah 1:17.

<sup>2</sup>Tht. = κυριου ; W = αγγελου.

<sup>3</sup>So Dodd, op. cit., p. 20.

θεου ("of God").

(2) HOSEA 12:5(4)

בכה ויתחנן לו

. . . he wept and sought  
his favor.

εκλαυσαν<sup>1</sup> και εδεηθη-  
σαν μου

Have they wept or have they  
suppliated me?

Possibly the translator understood בכה ויתחנן לו ("he wept and implored him") to mean that Jacob, as the representative of the Hebrew peoples, prayed to an angel -- an act reserved only for God. Consequently, he may have translated the verse to make it more acceptable to his readers and also to eliminate any suggestion that prayer could be made to a created being.

5. THE PROTECTION OF GOD AND HIS CHARACTER

Certain actions and attitudes of men towards God set forth in the text were apparently too derogatory of Him and/or His character to be literally rendered.

(1) ZECHARIAH 11:8

וְהֵאֱמַרְתִּי לָהֶם וְהֵאֱמַרְתִּי לָהֶם

. . . and they also  
detested me.

---

αυτου <sup>1</sup>α', σ', θ', οι λ', L-<sup>36</sup>(22): εκλαυσε(ν) και εδεηθη  
("He wept and prayed to him.").

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Targum's, "Hated My Worship"; see pages 303f.

<sup>3</sup>This verb occurs here only in the Twelve and only once more in the Old Testament (Proverbs 20:21). Hence no definite conclusion may be reached from the translation here.

και γαρ αι ψυχαι αυτων  
επωρουντο<sup>2</sup> επ εμε

For as their souls<sup>1</sup>  
roared against me,

This translation softens the offensive statement that anyone could detest (or abhor) God, but it also may spring from a different or a misread text. Geiger<sup>3</sup> emends **הכלה** to **הלל**<sup>4</sup> ("to rule, possess") and Horst<sup>5</sup> and Graetz<sup>6</sup>, to **הלל**<sup>7</sup> ("to abhor, detest, reject")<sup>8</sup>. The meaning of **הכלה** is uncertain<sup>9</sup>, and hence, no definite conclusion can be reached.

(2) MALACHI 1:7

**כמה נאכלנוך**

How have we polluted  
thee?<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This translation is anthropomorphic.

<sup>2</sup> α' = επερκασεν ; σ' = ηχημασεν .

<sup>3</sup>So Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 312.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 968, footnote.

<sup>5</sup>Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 244.

<sup>6</sup>So Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 312.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 968, footnote.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. the Syriac, "barked against me" (Wright, op. cit., p. 580) which preserves a derivative of **הכלה** (according to Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 312).

<sup>9</sup>Wright, C.H.H., op. cit., p. 580.

<sup>10</sup>The Revised Standard Version translates, "How have we polluted it?", following the Septuagint. Its footnote b reads "thee".

Εν τινι ηλυσγησαμεν<sup>1</sup>  
αυτους<sup>2</sup>

How have we polluted  
them?

This translation protects Deity by transforming the object of pollution, by the Israelites, from God to the cult objects. Procksch<sup>3</sup> emends the text to **והיטלנו** ("we polluted it", i.e., the altar), following the Septuagint, apparently considering that the Greek translation accurately translates the original Hebrew text.

This protective motive may explain also the translation in Habakkuk 2:4.

(3) HABAKKUK 2:4

והיטהו צדיק בִּישׁוֹ

. . . but the righteous  
shall live by his faith  
(faithfulness).

ο δε δικαιος εκ πιστεως<sup>4</sup>  
μου<sup>5</sup> ζησεται<sup>6</sup>

But the just shall live  
by faith in me.

<sup>1</sup>This verb usually translates **לִטַּל** ("pollute"). In *There are* Zephaniah 3:1 (secular use) the niph'al participle is *two quite* rendered **אֲפֹלֵטְרָמֶנִּי** ("redeemed"). *distinct* *verbs 5/2.*

<sup>2</sup>א', ס', ת' = **עֲמִלְנוּמֵנִי** ("to stain, sully, defile"). The Ethiopic substitutes nomen tuum for **אֲפֹלֵטְרָמֶנִּי**. This is also protective of Deity.

<sup>3</sup>Procksch, op. cit., p. 973, footnote.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Hosea 2:22(20) where **אֲפֹלֵטְרָמֶנִּי** is translated **עַל אֱמוּנָתִי** ("in faith").

<sup>5</sup>The Septuagint, Old Latin, and one codex = **בְּאֵמוּנָתִי** ("by my faith") according to Ward (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 14), et al. This is probably "a later change due to a different interpretation of the verse." (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 194).

<sup>6</sup>א' = **עַל אֱמוּנָתִי** ("in his faith"); ס' = **עַל אֱמוּנָתוֹ** ("in his own faith").

The Hebrew<sup>1</sup> passage suggests that a righteous man is self-sufficient enough to live by his own faithfulness (presumably directed towards God). Possibly the translator was offended by this implication and avoided it by altering the pronoun to refer to God. Alternatively, he may have possessed a different text or misread<sup>2</sup> the one he had.

(4) MICAH 2:9

מַעַל עַל־לִיָּה תִּקְחוּ הַדָּרִי  
לְעוֹלָם

. . . from their young  
children you take away  
my glory forever.

διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύ-  
ματα αὐτῶν ἐξώσθησαν  
ἐγγίστατε ὀρεσὶν αἰωνί-  
οις<sup>3</sup>

. . . for their wicked  
devices they have been  
expelled; draw ye near  
to the everlasting  
mountains.

The Septuagint avoids the concept of removing God's glory from His people, but, since it incorporates so many deviations, a very corrupt text may have been used by the translator, e.g.:

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum and Vulgate support the Masoretic Text (Sponehouse, op. cit., p. 194).

<sup>2</sup>The translation involves only the substitution of an , for a , .

<sup>3</sup>The Targum changes "My Glory" to "their glory", etc., but it is clearly based upon the Masoretic Text. Probably it was influenced by the Targum on I Samuel 4:22 (Taylor, op. cit., p. 64).



על<sup>1</sup> מעלליהם<sup>2</sup> רחקו<sup>3</sup>  
נעו<sup>4</sup> להררי עולם<sup>5</sup>

Because of their maltreatment they are removed; they draw near to the eternal hills.

The commentators differ considerably as to what Hebrew text the Septuagint may have possessed, and, therefore, no conclusion may be reached as to the translator's motive(s) for this particular rendering.

(5) MALACHI 1:14<sup>6</sup>

ושמי נורא בנויים

. . . and my name is  
feared among the  
nations.

<sup>1</sup>Following Taylor (op. cit., p. 63).

<sup>2</sup>According to Stekhoven (op. cit., p. 83). Stekhoven (loc. cit.) apparently omits this word; he considers מַעַל עֲלִיָּהֶם רַחֲקוּ to have been read by the Septuagint for the Masoretic Text's מַעַל עֲלִיָּהֶם חֲדָרִי. Taylor (op. cit., p. 63) considers the Septuagint's Text to be מַעַל עֲלִיָּהֶם ("his maltreatment") and Wutz (op. cit., p. 218), עֲלִיָּהֶם. Smith, Graetz, Rueben [op. cit., p. 20], Marti, Nowack, Sievers, Guthe, Haupt, Duhm (according to Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 56) emend following the Syriac, Septuagint, and Vulgate to עֲלִיָּהֶם; cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 935, footnote.

<sup>3</sup>Smith (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 56) considers the ἐξωσθησαν ("they have been expelled") and ἐγγίστατε ("draw near") both to be translations of רַחֲקוּ ("you take away"). Rueben (op. cit., p. 20) considers that the Septuagint read רַחֲקוּ for רַחֲקוּ. The above reading of רַחֲקוּ follows Taylor (op. cit., p. 63); cf. Stekhoven, op. cit., p. 83.

<sup>4</sup>So Taylor (loc. cit.), but Rueben (op. cit., p. 20), נעו.

<sup>5</sup>So Rueben (loc. cit.), Taylor (op. cit., pp. 63f); cf. Smith (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 56).

<sup>6</sup>Cf. also Zephaniah 3:2; Malachi 1:12; 2:11.

και τον ονομα μου  
επιφανες εν τοις  
εθνεσιν

. . . and my name is  
illustrious [manifest]  
among the nations.

This translation may have been chosen in order to protect the Name ( **יהוה** ) of Deity, but, more probably, it arises from poor knowledge of Hebrew on the part of the translator who mistook the root of the niphal participle, **נראה**, to be **ראה** instead of **ראה**. The consistency of the translation in the Twelve<sup>2</sup>, however, as opposed to its translation in other parts of the Old Testament both where no theological implication exists and even where such implications do exist, would seem to indicate that this consistent translation may be a protective alteration to avoid the offensive suggestion that God is ever terrible -- even to the heathen. Perhaps his text may have read **נראה**<sup>3</sup>. He also could have mistaken an **א** for an **ה** -- especially if he took offense at the Hebrew Text. This motivation may, perhaps, be seen even more clearly in Hosea 3:5 (and also Micah 7:17) where **וּפְחָדוֹ אֶל-יְהוָה** ("And they will come in fear to the Lord") has been softened to **και εκστησονται επι τω κυριω**<sup>4</sup> ("And will be amazed at the Lord"), although, of course, this alteration may be due, wholly or

<sup>1</sup> **α'** = επιφοβον ("feared").

<sup>2</sup> E.g., Zephaniah 2:11 **וְנֹרָא יְהוָה עֲלֵיהֶם**, ("The Lord will be terrible against them;") is translated **επιφανησε κυριος επι αυτους** ("The Lord will display himself illustriously [be manifested] against them,").

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the translator read **נראה** (cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 953, footnote on Zephaniah 2:11).

<sup>4</sup> **α'** (και) πτοηθησονται (επι κυριον), **σ'** = και επαινεσωσι τον κυριον.

in part, to a pro-Israel bias.

Moreover, certain actions of God were considered too derogatory of His Character to remain unchanged. Thus the idea of the complete destruction by God of the living creatures upon the earth, man and beast alike, and even the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, was too offensive, and so the main verb, **קָנָה** ("to make an end"), was translated in Zephaniah 1:2f by **ἐκλείπω** ("to remove, cease, end"). The verb also has been changed into an impersonal form which leaves unstated who or what is the agency producing the action<sup>1</sup>. The next verse (3b), quite consistently, has been softened to: "I will take away (**ἐξαίρω** for **קָנָה**) the lawless (**ἀνομους** <sup>2</sup> for **אֲשֵׁר**) from the face of the earth." This verb (**קָנָה**) occurs elsewhere in Amos 3:15 where the qal perfect is translated **προστεθῶσονται** (or **αφανισθῶσονται** as in L<sup>10</sup> -- 407<sup>mg</sup> Syh<sup>mg</sup> Arm. Th. Tht.).

(6) HOSEA 4:5

**בַּלַּיְלָהָ יִסְמְךָ אִמְךָ** (הִלַּיְלָהָ) . . . (by night;) and I  
will destroy your mother.

**νυκτι ὡμοίωσά<sup>3</sup> τὴν  
μητέρα σου** I have compared thy  
mother to the night:

<sup>1</sup>Represents only a change of pointing to a pual (Gerleman, op. cit., p. 2).

<sup>2</sup>So rel., Swete; **ἀνθρώπους** 46 Q.

<sup>3</sup>**α', θ' = νυκτος ἐσιώπησα** ("by night I kept silence"); **σ' = νυκτος σιωπήσω** ("by night I will keep silence").

The Septuagint may have softened the Hebrew to protect the translator's conception of Deity, but also the translator may have been unfamiliar with the two different Hebrew roots of **דמ**. Root I means "to compare, be like" and root II, "to destroy". Since, however, in four<sup>1</sup> of the six occurrences of this root **דמ** (root II) the Greek translation is *απορριπτω* ("to throw or put away, cast forth"), and in the remaining two<sup>2</sup> passages the verb **דמ** (root II) is translated by *ομοιω* ("to be like"), the translator indicates that he was familiar with both roots. Perhaps his text<sup>3</sup> did not contain a **ו** before **וידמית** ("and I will destroy"). If so, then a different word division and the use of the meaning of root I would suggest itself naturally to a translator wishing to avoid a statement which was offensive both to his conception of Deity and to his love of Israel.

(7) HOSEA 9:12<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 10:7,15 (twice); Obadiah 5.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 4:6; Zephaniah 1:11. The only other instance of **דמ**, which is root I, occurs in Hosea 12:10(11). There the Greek verb is also *ομοιω*.

<sup>3</sup>Procksch (*op. cit.*, p. 898 footnote) emends to **וידם ו תמיר ו אריר**.

<sup>4</sup>This verb (**כלל**) occurs elsewhere in the Twelve only in Hosea 9:14 and Malachi 3:4. In the former passage the Septuagint translates it by *ατεξεω* but in latter by *αθθενω* ("to be weak"). In both passages the usage is not theological.

וְשָׁכַלְתִּים מֵאֲדָם<sup>1</sup>

I will bereave them till  
none is left.

ατεκνωθησονται εξ  
ανθρωπων

. . . they shall be  
bereaved of them from  
among men:

The suggestion that God deliberately makes anyone childless may have been considered too offensive. Thus the translator, following a common procedure, may have considered the verb to be a pual form and translated it as if the text had been וְשָׁכַלְוּ<sup>2</sup>, i.e., ατεκνωθησονται ("they will be bereaved") -- a textual difference of a ך for a ך and the omission of a ך. Of course, he may have possessed a different text or misread his text.

(8) MICAH 6:14

לְחַרֵּב אֶתְךָ

I will give to the sword.

εις ρομφαιαν παραδο-  
θησονται

. . . to the sword they  
shall be delivered up.

Like the preceding passage the Septuagint uses a passive verb for the Hebrew's active verb. This translation likewise avoids a statement considered unworthy of Deity. Could the Septuagint<sup>3</sup> translator have read ךָ or ךָ for ךָ?

<sup>1</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Nyberg, op. cit., p. 70.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint alone "avoided ascribing the calamity to God," (Taylor, op. cit., p. 150).



The translations in Amos 4:10 of θανατος <sup>1</sup> ("death") for נִבְּרָה ("pestilence") and in Habakkuk 3:5 of λογος <sup>2</sup> ("word")<sup>3</sup> for נִבְּרָה ("pestilence") also may reflect a theological bias.

Another group of translations which may reflect this desire of protecting the concept of Deity consists in alterations of passages containing indecent language. In Hosea 2:12(10) ακαθαρσια <sup>4</sup> ("uncleanness") translates נִלְבָּשׁ ("the parts of shame") and in Nahum 3:5 αἰσχυνην <sup>5</sup> ("shame"), נָגַד ("nakedness").

Several passages whose translation may show that the translator attempted to safeguard his concept of Deity from derogatory actions have been considered. Certain ones of these softened translations involve verbs (Hebrew) which occur only once in the Twelve. Other translations may have arisen from Hebrew texts which are different (or read differently) from the Masoretic Text. Certain translations, however, may well have resulted from a desire to safeguard the

---

<sup>1</sup>α' = λοιμον ("plague"); δ' = πληγην ("blow, stroke").

<sup>2</sup>α' = λοιμος ("plague"); θ' = θανατος ("death").

<sup>3</sup>Cf. also Haggai 1:11.

<sup>4</sup>αμαρτιας νην ("sins") in S\* O.

<sup>5</sup>ασημοσυνην ("disgrace") in A' - 49 Cyr<sup>I</sup> Bas.

concept of Deity.

## 6. MONOTHEISTIC ELEMENTS<sup>1</sup>

The monotheistic belief of the translator is best seen in his uniform renderings of the plural  $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$  by the singular  $\text{θεος}$  whenever it refers to Yahweh. The plural is used for the heathen deities even at times when a singular form is found in the Hebrew. The Septuagint translator misses an opportunity to reveal his monotheistic belief in Hosea 12:4(3) by the retention of  $\text{θεος}$  ("God"). Aquila, however, seizes upon this to translate it by  $\text{αγγελος}$  ("angel") following the procedure of the Hebrew in the same context.

X                      X                      X                      X                      X

Although adequate evidence does not exist to prove that the translator consciously or unconsciously avoided or softened statements in the Hebrew which would indicate that God was not omnipresent, transcendent, omniscient, and unchangeable, the likelihood persists that the translator sought to safeguard Deity from derogatory actions and attitudes of men towards God, from derogatory action by God Himself, and the like.

---

<sup>1</sup>"In many of the passages . . . the LXX has the character of a sort of monotheistic Targum on the Hebrew text, rather than a strict translation. It laid before the Greek-speaking public a body of religious teachings from which practically every concession to polytheism had been eliminated, and presented the Jewish religion as a monotheistic faith in a sense which was not true of any other religion of the Hellenistic World." (Dodd, op. cit., p. 23f)

## CHAPTER V

### THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC TENDENCY<sup>1</sup> OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Although allusions have been made to the fact that in certain instances the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text, the large number of such examples have been generally overlooked. Perhaps translations which are more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew exceeds the number of translations which may reflect an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

These anthropomorphisms include minor changes.

Examples of these slight alterations are: (1) the addition of the pronoun implied in the Masoretic Text, e.g., αὐτον ("him") in Hosea 5:6; (2) a slight change of meaning in translation, e.g., in Micah 7:7 where יְיָ יִשְׁלָמֵנִי ("for the God of my salvation") is translated as ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτηρὶ ("for the God who is my saviour."); and (3)<sup>2</sup> a strengthening

---

<sup>1</sup>Not only is the increased anthropomorphic coloring to be seen in the attributing of human form, actions, etc., to God, but in one passage (Micah 7:4) the Septuagint alters the animistic description of Deity from comparing Him to a brier (רִיחַ = "as a brier") to likening Him to a devouring moth (ὡς σὴς ἐκτρώγων [α', ὡς βολις; σ', θ', ὡς ἀκανθα; Syriac, "like a rag"; Targum, "as from a thornbush" (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139)] = "like a consuming moth"). Taylor (op. cit., p. 165), Smith (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139), Vollers (op. cit., II, p. 10), and Ryssel (so Taylor, op. cit., p. 165) consider the Septuagint read here רִיחַ ("moth") for רִיחַ ("brier"), a change of a ר' and a ל'. This was translated appropriately by σὴς ("moth"). Ruben (op. cit., p. 22) considers the Septuagint to have read רִיחַ רִיחַ.

<sup>2</sup>Another slight change which occurs in the Septuagint is the translation of לֹא יִירָא ("to be afraid") as θάρσεν ("to be of good courage") in Joel 2:21f; Zephaniah 3:16; Haggai 2:5; Zechariah 8:13, 15. It translates the meaning of the Hebrew in positive term instead of the negative language of the Masoretic Text.

of the anthropomorphism as in Hosea 13:5 where אֲנִי יָדַעְתִּיךָ  
 ("It was I who knew you") is translated as ἐγὼ ἐποίμαινον σε  
 ("It was I who fed you"). This rendition is the equivalent  
 of אֲנִי יָדַעְתִּיךָ<sup>1</sup> ("I fed you")<sup>2</sup>.

# 1. THE DESCRIPTION OF GOD AS A HUMAN BEING

Although there are several passages in which the Septuagint more strongly describes God in anthropomorphic terms than the Masoretic Text does, it still does not state that God is a man<sup>3</sup>.

## (1) HOSEA 1:6

כִּי־אֶפְדֶּה אֹתָם<sup>4</sup> . . . that I should in  
any wise pardon them.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>So Procksch (op. cit., p. 908); Harper (op. cit., p. 392) emends thus with the Septuagint and the Syriac, following Sebök, Wellhausen, Graetz [op. cit., p. 14], Guthe, Loftman, Smith (G.A.) (so Harper, loc. cit.), Marti (op. cit., p. 101), Robinson (T.H.) (op. cit., p. 50); cf. Nowack and Oettli. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 102) adds ". . . was sicher wegen der Paronomasie mit אֶפְדֶּה." Thus the translator may have considered the initial א as a dittograph (or was it lacking?) and read the א as אה.

<sup>2</sup>The Masoretic Text here may be a softening of the original Hebrew Text which the Septuagint translated. See pages 132f, especially footnote 1, page 133.

<sup>3</sup>Although it does compare God more definitely to a man by the addition of ἄνθρωπος ("man"). See pages 39f.

<sup>4</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 895, footnote) emends to אֶפְדֶּה [אֶפְדֶּה].

<sup>5</sup>The Masoretic Text here has been variously understood. Apparently the Targum and Aquila understood אֶפְדֶּה in the sense of 'to forgive' (Harper, op. cit., p. 206), and the Syriac is "sklavisch wörtlich" (so Nyberg, op. cit., p. 21). How the Septuagint understood the text is not absolutely certain.

<sup>6</sup>Following the American Jewish Translation.

αλλ η αντιτασσομενος  
αντιταξομαι<sup>1</sup> αυτοις

. . . but will set myself  
against them.

By the rendering of  $\text{נָשָׂא}$  ("to forgive") by  $\text{αντιτασσομαι}$  ("to range in battle") the translator pictures God as in battle against men, a concept which is considerably more anthropomorphic than the received Hebrew text. The Septuagint may have had a different text (or misread one). Drake suggests their text may have been  $\text{נָשָׂא נָשָׂא}$ <sup>2</sup> ("I will make ruler"). Vollers<sup>3</sup> considers that the translator read a form of  $\text{יִשָּׂא}$  ("to be like")<sup>4</sup>, but Wünsche comments, "Offenbar ganz unrichtig Übersetzung die LXX: . . . den so kommt  $\text{נָשָׂא}$  nur im Hitp. vor."<sup>5</sup>

Although the Targum<sup>6</sup>, Syriac, Vulgate, et al., essentially reflect the Masoretic Text, this investigator suggests that here the Septuagint may translate the original Hebrew text. He feels that the context favors the rendering of the Septuagint because (1) it would intensify the preceding statement, "for I will no more have pity on the

<sup>1</sup> α' = επιλησσομαι αυτων ("I forgot them").

<sup>2</sup> As in I Kings 11:34 (Drake, op. cit., p. 52).

<sup>3</sup> Vollers, I, op. cit., p. 243.

<sup>4</sup> In Proverbs 3:15  $\text{αντιτασσω}$  ("to set in battle") translates  $\text{יִשָּׂא}$  ("can compare") and in Obadiah 7 of  $\text{יִשָּׂא}$  -- so Vollers, loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup> Wünsche, op. cit., p. 26.

<sup>6</sup> E.g., Wünsche (loc. cit.), "Es [Targum] kommt nun weiter aber auch die Bedeutung an, die man  $\text{נָשָׂא}$  giebt."



house of Judah," and (2) it would more closely parallel the last half of the following verse (referring to Judah), ". . . and I will deliver them. . .; I will not deliver them by bow, nor by sword. . .".

Probably nothing conclusive may be established from the use of ἀντιτασσομαι ("to set in battle") in the Septuagint. Twice it occurs in passages where it has no Hebrew equivalent; twice the Hebrew equivalent is uncertain. Twice the Hebrew equivalent is שׁוּב ("to lift up"), once, רִיב (hiphil = "to mock, scorn"), once, שׁוּב ("to be like"), and once, שׁוּב ("to place"). This varied usage lends little support to either Voller's or Drake's supposition. Moreover, it serves to illustrate the difficulty of establishing any positive conclusions.

(2) MALACHI 1:4<sup>1</sup>

וְעַם אֲשֶׁר-רָעָה עִמִּי  
עַד-עוֹלָם

. . . the people with whom  
the Lord is angry forever.

καὶ λαὸς ἐφ' ὃν παρα-  
τέτακται κύριος ἕως  
αἰῶνος

A people to whom the Lord  
hath ever been opposed.

This translation may represent an attempt to avoid the offensive thought that God could be eternally angry<sup>2</sup>, but it also may represent more accurately the original Hebrew text which has been softened to avoid its anthropomorphic implications.

<sup>1</sup>See pages 80f.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. also Zechariah 1:12; see pages 79f.

## (3) HABAKKUK 2:4

לא-ישרה נפשו ב

. . . he whose soul is not  
upright in him . . .οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ  
μου<sup>1</sup> ἐν αὐτῷ. . . my soul has no  
pleasure in him. . .

Procksch<sup>2</sup> emends to לא רצחה נפשי ב ("my soul has no pleasure in him") following the Septuagint. Graetz<sup>3</sup> also emends to נפשי ("my soul"). Since the text here is so corrupt<sup>4</sup>, no final conclusion may be reached except that the translation is anthropopathic (and anthropomorphic) whereas the Masoretic Text is neither.

## (4) ZEPHANIAH 3:8

ליום קומי לער<sup>5</sup>Until the day that I  
rise up to the prey;<sup>6</sup>εἰς ἡμέραν ἀναστάσεως  
μου εἰς μαρτυρίον<sup>7</sup>. . . until the day when  
I rise up for a witness:<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>α' = οὐκ εὐθεία ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ . The Septuagint may be more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text.

<sup>2</sup>Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 947, footnote.

<sup>3</sup>Graetz (*op. cit.*, p. 21) follows here one manuscript (so Kennicott, *op. cit.*, p. 283), Aquila, and the Septuagint.

<sup>4</sup>"The first member of this couplet [Habakkuk 2:4] is corrupt past safe reconstruction." (Smith, Ward Bower, *op. cit.*, p. 14).

<sup>5</sup>Procksch (*op. cit.*, p. 954, footnote) emends the vocalization to "as a witness" following the Septuagint and Syriac.

<sup>6</sup>The American Jewish Translation.

<sup>7</sup>σ' = ἐγερσεως μου αἰωνιας.

<sup>8</sup>Bagster, *op. cit.*, p. 1111; cf. the Revised Standard Version, "for the day when I arise as a witness,".

This translation may have been selected to safeguard the translator's concept of Deity. The Syriac, Targum, and Arabic follow the Septuagint, as do many commentators<sup>1</sup>, perhaps substituting an anthropomorphism for an animism.

## 2. THE POSSESSION BY GOD OF PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

There are also an increased number of anthropomorphisms in the Septuagint where the translation ascribes a portion of the human body to God, whereas the Hebrew does not describe God in the same terms.

### (1) MALACHI 2:3

הִנְנִי בָּעַר לָכֶם אֶת-הַזֶּרַע

Behold, I will rebuke  
your offspring,

ἰδου ἐγὼ ἀφορίζω ὑμῖν  
τὸν ὤμον<sup>2</sup>

Behold I set apart for  
you the shoulder,

The Greek rendition changes the meaning both of the verb and of its object, although the object ( τὸν ὤμον = "the shoulder") requires only a change of vocalization<sup>3</sup>. The Greek verb, ἀφορίζω ("I set apart"), requires only the interchange in position of the ς and ρ<sup>4</sup>. These slight

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Smith (J.M.P.), Hitzig, Schwalley, Wellhausen, Smith (G.A.), Nowack, Marti, Orelli, Syriac, Targum, van Hoonacker, Rothstein, Graetz, Fragnani, Duhm (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 253).

<sup>2</sup>α'(σ') ἰδου ἐγ(ν)ω ἐπιτιμῶ ὑμῖν σὺν τῷ βραχίονι.

<sup>3</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 974, footnote) emends to הַזֶּרַע following the Syriac and Septuagint.

<sup>4</sup>So Smith (Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 45).

changes make it at least as probable that the Masoretes (or some earlier scribal group) changed the vocalization and interchanged some consonants as is the likelihood that the Septuagint made these anthropomorphic changes unnecessarily. Therefore, probably the Septuagint translated a Hebrew text which differed slightly from our Masoretic Text.

(2) HOSEA 9:12

כִּי-גַם-אֲנִי לָהֶם בָּשָׂרִי כָהֵן

Woe to them when I  
depart from them!

διότι και ουαι αυτοις εστι  
σαρξ μου εξ αυτων<sup>1</sup>

. . . for (and alas for  
them! my flesh is of  
them). . .

The translation of בָּשָׂרִי ("my departure" or "when I depart") by סַרְסָם ("my flesh") cannot have arisen because of belief in a transcendent, non-spatial Deity since the translation is more offensive than the Hebrew itself. The translations of the Septuagint and of Theodotion require only a change of vocalization and a text without an ו, namely בָּשָׂרִי<sup>2</sup>. Aquila's<sup>3</sup> translation requires either the equation, בָּשָׂרִי = בָּשָׂרִי<sup>4</sup>, or a different reading בָּשָׂרִי.

---

<sup>1</sup>α' = εκκλιναντος μου απ αυτων ("my turning away from them"); θ' = vae eis σαρξ μου εξ αυτων ("my flesh (is) of them").

<sup>2</sup>So Procksch (op. cit., p. 904 footnote), Scott (op. cit., p. 141), and Harper (op. cit., p. 335).

<sup>3</sup>See footnote 1 above.

<sup>4</sup>So also the Vulgate, Targum, Rosenmülleri, Maurer, Keil, Wellhausen, Orelli, Nowack, et al., (according to Harper, op. cit., p. 341). Against this view "is the fact that Hosea regularly writes ו;" (Harper, loc. cit.).

The latter is supported by several manuscripts and by the Vulgate<sup>1</sup>.

Several factors support the view that the translations of the Septuagint and of Theodotion represent the original Hebrew text and vocalization. First, it is extremely unlikely that the Septuagint would interpret **בשרי** (or even more so **בשרי**) as referring to God's flesh<sup>2</sup> unless the Alexandrian theologians really believed flesh to represent the true vocalization of the correct consonantal text. Secondly, this assumption would explain why the Jews have been charged with altering this text. Thirdly, others have claimed that the original text should be either **בשרי**<sup>3</sup> ("My flesh") or **בשרי**<sup>3</sup> ("My incarnation") but that the Jews had interpreted it as if it had been spelled with an **ס**<sup>4</sup> and were derived from **סר** ("to turn"). Fourthly, the Targums<sup>5</sup> translation need not require a text containing **בשרי** or

---

<sup>1</sup>So Drake, op. cit., p. 141; cf. Harper, op. cit., p. 341.

<sup>2</sup>Could Scott's (op. cit., pp. 141f) suggestion that "Israel as circumcised bore in the flesh the token of their adoption, and thus might be called 'the flesh of God'" be correct? "Cf. Jer. xi.15: 'The holy flesh is passed from thee.'" (Scott, loc. cit.). In this connection, Knight (op. cit., p. 42) states, "This totality of the nephesh of God must therefore include within it that which must correspond with what man knows as bāsār (flesh)."

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 36), Nyberg (op. cit., p. 70), Harper (op. cit., p. 335), Hitzig, Simson, Ewald, and Guthe read **בשרי** (so Harper, loc. cit.).

<sup>4</sup>See footnote 4, page 156.

<sup>5</sup>See page 312.



וְנִשְׁמָה,<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, the translator of the Targum may have considered נִשְׁמָה מֵהֶם ("My flesh is of them") as limiting to space the non-spatial Deity. If he made this interpretation, then the use of Shekinah<sup>2</sup> is readily understood. Finally, the reason that the Masoretes altered their text and vocalization is easier to understand than to assume that the Septuagint translator misunderstood or altered his text in giving this translation.

Another interesting suggestion is made by Scott<sup>3</sup> that Israel might be called "the flesh of God". He believed that this interpretation should deserve more consideration. The interpretation is interesting, yet the best solution still is to say with Nyberg<sup>4</sup>, "G is ganz tōricht;".

(3) HOSEA 11:3

וְנִשְׁמָה-לָּם נִשְׁמָה

Taking them by their  
arms;<sup>5</sup>

ανελαβον αυτου επι  
τον βραχίονα μου

I took him up in my  
arms.<sup>6</sup>

The Greek translation alters the verb and the pro-

---

<sup>1</sup>See footnote 4, page 156.

<sup>2</sup>The Targum more likely interpreted as the Masoretes did.

<sup>3</sup>Scott, op. cit., pp. 141f.

<sup>4</sup>Nyberg, op. cit., p. 70.

<sup>5</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>6</sup>The Revised Standard Version, following the Septuagint, translates, "I took them up in my arms;".

nominal suffix of the Hebrew. It would translate adequately a text like *וְלָקַחְתִּי אֹתוֹ בְּאַרְצִי*<sup>1</sup> ("I took him up in my arms"). Such a text differs from the Masoretic Text in only three particulars. The support of the other versions, e.g., Targum, Syriac, etc., has led many commentators<sup>2</sup> to follow them in considering that the original Hebrew text was more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text. On the other hand, Nyberg considers that the Syriac and Septuagint are only conjectures dependent upon the mutilated reading *אֶת*<sup>3</sup>. Perhaps Nyberg is too cautious here, and the versions may depend not so much upon a mutilated reading as upon the preservation of a Hebrew text which the context favors more readily than it does the Masoretic Text. If this assumption is correct, the reading of *αὐτόν* ("him") does not require that the final *א* of *אֶת* be read (or misread) as an *א*. This translation may refer back only to the antecedent, Ephraim. Certainly if the Masoretic Text is considered as being mutilated (deliberately or otherwise), the translation is explained more easily than if the assumption is made that the Septuagint was translated from a mutilated Hebrew text.

#### (4) MALACHI 3:16

---

<sup>1</sup>So Procksch (*op. cit.*, p. 906, footnote) emends to *וְלָקַחְתִּי אֹתָם בְּאַרְצִי* ("I took them up in my arms"). He follows the Targum, Vulgate, Syriac, and Septuagint; see also pages 68f.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Robinson, Ewald, Harper, etc. See Harper (*op. cit.*, p. 360) for an impressive list.

<sup>3</sup>"Die Lesarten von GS sind Konjekturen auf Grund der verstümmelten LA *אֶת*." (Nyberg, *op. cit.*, p. 85).

וַיִּכְתֹּב סֵפֶר זִכְרוֹן<sup>1</sup> לְפָנָיו

. . . and a book of remembrance was written before him. . .

καὶ ἐγράψε βιβλίον μνη-  
μοσύνης ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ

. . . and [the Lord] wrote a book of remembrance before him. . .

The translation of וַיִּכְתֹּב ("and was written") as καὶ ἐγράψε ("and he wrote") requires only a change of vocalization, yet the fact that the translator would vocalize וַיִּכְתֹּב as an active voice is strange indeed if he was opposed to anthropomorphisms! This suggestion that God possessed a hand and could write is avoided in the Masoretic Text. Could the Septuagint (and Syriac<sup>2</sup>) represent the original Hebrew traditional vocalization? Nowack<sup>3</sup> emends here, following the Septuagint.

(5) AMOS 8:3

וְהָיָה שִׁוְיוֹ

. . . shall be cast out in silence.

ἐπιρριψω σιωπῇ

I will bring on silence.

The rendering of וְהָיָה שִׁוְיוֹ ("shall be cast out") as ἐπιρριψω ("I will cast forth") = וְהָיָה שִׁוְיוֹ<sup>4</sup> ["I will cast out"] is slightly more anthropomorphic in its suggestion

<sup>1</sup>See pages 51ff. for a discussion of the anthropomorphism, 'the face of God'.

<sup>2</sup>So Beyer (Mitchell, Smith, Beyer, *op. cit.*, p. 84).

<sup>3</sup>According to Beyer (*loc. cit.*).

<sup>4</sup>So Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 925, footnote.

that God possesses a hand. Unlike the preceding example, the Greek translation requires a different Hebrew 'Vorlage' than our Masoretic Text, yet the only alteration needed in the consonantal text is the substitution of  $\text{נ}$  for  $\text{ה}$  -- an interchange which is not unusual in the Septuagint. The Masoretes (or some earlier scribal group) could have made this substitution as readily as the Greek translator.

(6) HOSEA 11:4<sup>1</sup>

The concept of sight is involved in the Greek translation of this passage.

$\text{וַיִּבֶן}^3 \text{ וַיִּזְקַם}^2$

. . . and I bent down  
to them literally, him  
and fed them.

και επιβλεψομαι προς  
αυτον δυνησομαι αυτω<sup>4</sup>

. . . and I will keep an  
eye upon him, and  
exercise authority over  
him.

The translation of  $\text{וַיִּזְקַם}$  ("and I inclined") by  
και επιβλεψομαι ("and I looked upon") increases the anthropo-

<sup>1</sup>See pages 42f.

<sup>2</sup>A hiphil imperfect (so Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 640). Manger, Hesselberg, Umbreit, Keil, Cheyne, Smith (G.A.) -- so Harper (op. cit., p. 364) -- the American Jewish Translation, and Ewald consider it to be an adjective, meaning gently. Ewald (op. cit., I, p. 290) says it can be from  $\text{נָזַק}$ , to incline.

<sup>3</sup>A hiphil (?), so Brown, Driver, Briggs (op. cit., p. 37).

<sup>4</sup> $\alpha'$  ( $\theta'$ ) - και εκλινα προς αυτον βρωματα [βρωσιν]  
("and I leaned to him food [meat]");  $\sigma'$  - και εξεκλινα  
προς αυτον τροφην ("and I bent towards him nourishment").

morphic picture. Perhaps the translator here followed a different text in which וַאֲנִי<sup>1</sup> ("and I looked") occurred. The Targum<sup>2</sup> apparently supports the Septuagint while the Syriac<sup>3</sup> follows the Masoretic Text. Perhaps here, too, the Greek translation may have preserved the meaning of the original text.

(7) ZEPHANIAH 3:16

אמר	. . . it shall be said . . .
επει κυριος	. . . the Lord will say . . .

The translation here again is more anthropomorphic, but the text which the Septuagint used could have been read (or misread) easily as אמר .. ("the Lord will say") -- a doubling only of the . . . The form .. (= the Lord) is quite frequent in the Targum. Gerleman suggests an alternative but similar proposal: "LXX dürfte eine erklärende, freie Übertragung bieten. Möglich ist aber, dass der Übersetzer das -Präfix als eine Verkürzung des יהוה aufgefasst habe: אמר" <sup>4</sup>. On the other hand, the Masoretic Text here may have softened the traditional Hebrew text.

<sup>1</sup>So Procksch (op. cit., p. 906 footnote) and Rueben (op. cit., p. 19); cf. וַאֲנִי (so Harper [op. cit., p. 361], Houtsma, Oort, Valeton [according to Harper, loc. cit.]). See also Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85).

<sup>2</sup>The Targum = ואניטיב אלו (so Rueben, op. cit., p. 19).

<sup>3</sup>So Harper (op. cit., p. 361), Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85), and Procksch (op. cit., p. 906, footnote).

<sup>4</sup>Gerleman, op. cit., p. 61.



## (8) HAGGAI 2:1

הַדְבָר־יְהוָה

. . . the word of the  
Lord . . .

ελαλησε<sup>1</sup> κυριος

. . . the Lord spoke . .

This rendering requires only a change of vocalization, and both the translation and the Hebrew convey almost the same picture. This example is illustrative of many passages which have been omitted by this investigator.

## (9) HOSEA 11:2

וְכַלֵּן כִּן מִלֵּךְ יִקְרָא  
מִמֶּנִּי יִפְּנֹּנ

The more they called  
them, the more they went  
away from them;<sup>2</sup>

καθως μετεκαλεσα  
αυτους ουτως απωχοντο  
εκ προσωπου μου

<sup>3</sup>

The more I called them,  
the more they ran from  
my presence.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>S\* = ελαβεν .

<sup>2</sup>Following the Revised Standard Version footnotes y and z, p. 944.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint = יִקְרָא according to Harper (op. cit., p. 360). Oort, Winckler, Valetton, Guthe, Ruben (op. cit., p. 19), Loftman, Smith (G.A.), Oettli, Halévy, Cheyne (op. cit., p. 127), Marti (op. cit., p. 86) (so Harper, op. cit., p. 360), Vollers (op. cit., I, p. 255), and Wutz (op. cit., p. 405). Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 42), Harper (op. cit., p. 360, and Wellhausen (so Harper, loc. cit.) emends to יִקְרָא (יִקְרָא) with the יִקְרָא from verse one. Graetz (op. cit., p. 14) emends to יִקְרָא יִפְּנֹנ (so Harper, op. cit., p. 360). Oort (op. cit., p. 139; so Harper op. cit., p. 360) and Nyberg (op. cit., p. 84) considered that the Septuagint = יִקְרָא (יִפְּנֹנ).

<sup>4</sup>The Revised Standard Version follows the Septuagint here.

This translation of יָקָר ("they called") by καθως μετεκαλεσα ("the more I called") is perhaps the most striking of this group of anthropomorphic translations. The context certainly favors the Septuagint here and suggests that the Masoretes<sup>1</sup> (or some earlier group), motivated perhaps by a burning pro-Israel zeal or by an anti-anthropomorphic bias (or both), altered a text like כִּן הָלְכוּ לָהֶם כִּן יָקָר(וּ) <sup>4</sup>וְהֵלְכוּ <sup>3</sup>לִפְנֵי ( "the more I called to them, the more they went away from Me; they..."). Thus the Israelites were no longer said to flee from God but from the Egyptians. Thus, with two simple changes, an objectionable anthropomorphism and an objectionable religious action on the part of Israel were removed, and a favorable action by Israel was substituted. The Targum's translation of הִלְכִּי ("I sent") supports the Septuagint's translation of the verb in the first person singular.

(10) ZECHARIAH 8:22<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>For an alternate suggestion, see Nyberg, op. cit., pp. 84f.

<sup>2</sup>This was connected with the next clause; cf. the Septuagint's αυτοι ("they").

<sup>3</sup>Following Procksch (op. cit., p. 906, footnotes), Harper (op. cit., p. 360), the Syriac, Michaelis, Dathe, Bauer, Oort (op. cit., p. 139), Wellhausen, Valetton, Graetz [op. cit., p. 14], Guthe, Smith [G.A.], Nowack, Oettli, Halévy, Cheyne (op. cit., p. 127), Marti (op. cit., p. 86) (so Harper, op. cit., p. 360), Scott (op. cit., p. 144); cf. Ruben (op. cit., p. 19).

<sup>4</sup>Following Procksch (op. cit., p. 906, footnotes).

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Zechariah 8:21.

לבקש את-יְהוָה צבֹאוֹת  
בִּירוּשָׁלַם

. . . to seek the Lord of  
hosts in Jerusalem. . .

εχζητησαι το προσωπον <sup>1</sup>  
κυριου παντοκρατορος  
εν Ιερουσαλημ

. . . will come to seek the  
face of the Lord Almighty  
at Jerusalem, . . .

The Greek translation here is more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew because of the addition of το προσωπον ("the face"). Could the Septuagint translator have added it to employ the intermediary of the 'Presence of the Lord' to soften the concept of seeking the Lord?

### 3. ACTIONS OF MEN TOWARD DEITY WHICH CONVEY ANTHROPOMORPHIC IMPLICATIONS

Certain actions of men towards Deity in the Septuagint convey the idea that God has a human (or a least physical) form. Many of these passages in the Masoretic Text do not convey the same anthropomorphic implications.

#### (1) MICAH 6:6

במה אֶפְתָּח לְפָנֶיךָ יְהוָה

With what shall I come  
before the Lord,

εν τινι καταλαβω<sup>2</sup>  
τον κυριον

By what means shall I  
gain over [seize hold  
of] the Lord?

Both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint are

<sup>1</sup>36, 410 = ονομα ("name").

<sup>2</sup>Marti (op. cit., p. 293) says, "Das Verb  $\alpha\lambda\alpha\beta\omega$  ist in der vordeuteronomischen Litteratur nicht gebracht ausser + u / I Sam. 20<sup>25</sup>, wenn dort in der üblichen Weise nach LXX korrigiert wird. . .".

anthropomorphic, but the latter has heightened the anthropomorphism.

(2) ZEPHANIAH 1:6

וְיִשְׁאַל אֵלָיו<sup>1</sup> . . . or inquire of him.

και τους μη αντεχο- . . . and them who cleave  
μενους του κυριου<sup>2</sup> not to him.

The rendering of שָׁאַל ("inquire") by αντεχομενους ("those cleaving") certainly intensifies the anthropomorphism. While inquiry could be made of a spirit (and a spirit could even be sought), a person scarcely could cleave to a spirit without a physical form.

(3) JOEL 1:20

גם-בהמות שדה תערוג . . . Even the wild beasts cry  
לִי לֵאמֹר to thee . . .

και τα κτηνη του πεδίου . . . To thee indeed the cattle  
ανεβλεψαν<sup>3</sup> προς σε in the plain have looked  
up,

The meaning of the verb, תערוג , is uncertain. Usually, as by Brown, Driver, and Briggs<sup>4</sup>, it is derived from

<sup>1</sup>Gerleman (op. cit., p. 7) states, "Die synonymen Ausdrücke וְיִשְׁאַל אֵלָיו-אֵלָיו und וְיִשְׁאַל אֵלָיו sind wahrscheinlich Varianten."

<sup>2</sup>Schwalley (op. cit., p. 171) states, "Hier liegt natürlich nichts als eine glättende Uebersetzung des M. T. vor."

<sup>3</sup>α' = επρασιωθη ("be divided into beds" -- so Liddell, Scott, Jones, op. cit., II, p. 1460).

<sup>4</sup>Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 788; Bewer (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 92).

גָּרַר ("to bend, long for"). Apparently Aquila connected it also with the root גָּרַר. Bewer<sup>1</sup> (as also the Revised Standard Version) considers the interpretation of the Rabbis, the Syriac, et al. to be more acceptable -- i.e., that the meaning of the verb is "to cry, cry aloud".

This uncertainty of meaning may explain the Septuagint's translation of αναβλεπω ("to look up"), but in any case both translations are anthropomorphic. Perhaps the Greek translation implies a more definite physical form to Deity than the Masoretic Text.

#### (4) MICAH 2:1

בְּיָדָם לִשְׁמֹרֶתָם

Because it is in the power of their hand.

διότι οὐκ ἦσαν πρὸς  
τον θεον τας χειρας  
αυτων<sup>2</sup>

. . . for they did not  
lift up their hands to  
God.

The interpretation which the Septuagint translator gave to the Hebrew text is uncertain. Geiger<sup>3</sup> considered it to mean "the God of my hand", and Kuenen<sup>4</sup>, to mean "because their might is their God". Probably the translator con-

<sup>1</sup>Smith, Ward, Bewer, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup>The Syriac follows the Septuagint but omits the negative (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 54). α' = οτι ισχυρον χειρ αυτων ; σ' = οτι ισχυεν η χειρ αυτων ; θ' = διοτι εχουσιν ισχυν την χειρα αυτων .

<sup>3</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 42.

<sup>4</sup>Loc. cit.



sidered his text to mean, "their hand is against God"<sup>1</sup> -- an offensive, anthropomorphic statement which he softened slightly. Although "there can be no doubt of the correctness of the M.T."<sup>2</sup>, yet the Masoretic Text could represent a softening of an offensive, anthropomorphic text which differs only in vocalization from our present Masoretic Text.

#### 4. ANTHROPOMORPHIC ACTIONS OF DEITY

Several passages in the Septuagint ascribe to Deity certain anthropomorphic actions<sup>3</sup> which are absent in the Masoretic Text.

##### (1) MICAH 4:10

יִלְיִן אַתָּה

There you shall be  
rescued,

ἐκεῖθεν ρυσεται  
σε

Thence he will deliver  
thee;

Although the Greek translation gives the same sense as the Masoretic Text, it is slightly anthropomorphic whereas, the Masoretic is not. Perhaps the translation may depend upon a different (or misread) text, as, e.g., יִלְיִן אַתָּה ("there he will rescue you"). This suggested text involves

---

<sup>1</sup>Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 42.

<sup>3</sup>In the Septuagint of Zechariah 3:9 the concept of God as engraving (חָצַב) is altered to that of God as digging (ορυσσω). Both concepts are anthropomorphic. Aquila uses διαγλυφω and Symmachus, γλυφω.

a substitution of  $\gamma$  for  $\cdot$  and of  $\cdot$  for  $n$ . The passive voice of the Hebrew, however, is frequently rendered as an active voice in the Greek translation.

(2) ZEPHANIAH 1:17

וְשֹׁפָךְ דָּמָם כַּעֲפָר

\* \* \* their blood shall  
be poured out like dust,

καὶ ἐκχέει τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν  
ὡς χόυν

\* \* \* therefore he will  
pour out their blood like  
dust. . .

This passage offers another example of the Septuagint using an active voice instead of a passive voice as in the Masoretic Text. Here the Greek translation involves only a change of vocalization. Apparently the Septuagint considered that God would pour out their blood as dust -- in fact several Greek manuscripts change the  $\epsilon\chi\chi\epsilon\iota$  ("he will pour out") to  $\epsilon\chi\chi\epsilon\omega$ <sup>1</sup> ("I will pour out") which emphasizes the fact that God is the subject of the verb. Possibly the Masoretes (or an earlier scribal group) changed the vocalization of  $\text{שֹׁפָךְ}$  from a piel (or qal) stem to a pual to avoid the offensive implications in the Hebrew. If so, then the Septuagint here preserves the original.

(3) THE TRANSLATION OF THE HIPHIL STEM

The translations of Nahum 2:13(14), Zephaniah 1:17, and Haggai 2:7 may indicate an original anthropomorphism or

---

<sup>1</sup>L<sup>o</sup> - 407 233<sup>1</sup> La<sup>s</sup> Cyr<sup>p</sup> Th. Tht. Spec. Or-lat VI 78  
Lo. Gild.

may only illustrate the difficulties of the translator in rendering the Hebrew hiphil stem. In these passages the causative force softens considerably the anthropomorphism which is apparent in the Greek translation. The Hebrew clauses of these verses respectively are: **וְהִנְעַרְתִּי** ("and I will [cause to] burn"), **וְהִצַּרְתִּי לָאָדָם** ("I bring distress on men,"), and **וְהִרְעַשְׁתִּי** ("And I will [cause to] shake"). The translator has appropriately rendered them as **καὶ ἐκκαυσω** ("and I will burn out"), **καὶ ἐκθλίψω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους** ("And I will bring distress upon [afflict] the men"), and **καὶ συσσεισω** ("and I will convulse"), respectively.<sup>1</sup>

(4) MALACHI 3:11

**וְלֹא-יִשְׁחָה**

. . . so that it will  
not destroy . . .

**καὶ οὐ μὴ διαφθείρω**

. . . and [I will] no  
more destroy . . .

The translator may have had (or misread) a text in which an **א** occurred for the **י** of the Masoretic Text. Perhaps the Hebrew text may have been altered to soften an offensive statement regarding Deity.

(5) HOSEA 2:4(2)

**וְהָרַחֵק וְהָסִיר מִפָּנֶיהָ**

. . . that she put away  
her harlotry from her  
face,

<sup>1</sup>The same is true of the translation of **אֲנִי מִרְעִישׁ** ("I am about [or causing] to shake") in Haggai 2:21 as **Εγω σειω** ("I will shake").

και εξαρω<sup>1</sup> την πορνει-  
αν αυτης εκ προσωπου  
μου

Therefore I will remove  
her fornication from  
before me . . .

The rendering of וְהָרַח ( "that she put away" ) by και εξαρω ( "and I will remove" ) may depend upon a different text, e.g., (וְהָרַח) <sup>2</sup> ( "and I put away" ), but the translation of מִפְּנֵיהָ ( "from her face" ) by εκ προσωπου μου ( "from my face" ) probably depends upon a text in which the final ה was missing. Moreover, both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint<sup>3</sup> require essentially the same consonants but in different order. The Septuagint has placed the final ה as the second consonant and has transposed the second consonant (ח) to become the fifth consonant.

An alternate suggestion is that the Masoretic (or an earlier scribal group) possessed a text such as, e.g.,

וְהָרַח וְנִוְנִיהָ מִפְּנֵי, which they considered either to be too derogatory of Deity (interpreting it as the Septuagint to mean that God would remove Israel's harlotries from His presence) or else thought it too difficult to understand. Nyberg<sup>4</sup> considers that the Septuagint's reading is inferior

---

<sup>1</sup> α' = αποστησάτω ( "let her remove" ); the Ethiopic= the Septuagint (so Harper, op. cit., p. 225).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Nyberg, op. cit., p. 22.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint perhaps has an additional .. Nyberg (loc. cit.) does not consider that the extra . . . necessary.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. ". . . eine schlechte LA, die im Zusammenhange keinen erträglichen Sinn ergibt" (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 22).

to the Masoretic Text, but Harper<sup>1</sup> considers the Septuagint to be noteworthy. Moreover, Vollers<sup>2</sup> and Lofthouse<sup>3</sup> consider that the Masoretic Text emended  $\epsilon\kappa$  προσώπου μου =  $\text{וְאֶפְסַח}$  ("from my face") to  $\text{וְאֶפְסַח$  ("from her face") on theological grounds. If the Masoretic Text was altered by this addition (or transposition) of an  $\text{ה}$ , the transposition of the  $\text{ה}$  by the same group is made more probable.

(6) MALACHI 2:15<sup>4</sup>

$\text{וְיִזְכֹּר אֱלֹהִים וְיִזְכֹּר}$   
 $\text{אֱלֹהִים}$

And what does he desire?  
Godly offspring.

$\text{Τί ἄλλο ἢ σπέρμα}$   
 $\text{ζητεῖ ὁ θεός}$

What does God seek but  
a seed?<sup>5</sup>

Apparently the Septuagint read (or interpreted) the Hebrew text as  $\text{וְיִזְכֹּר אֱלֹהִים וְיִזְכֹּר אֱלֹהִים (-) אֱלֹהִים}$ <sup>6</sup> ("What other than a seed is God seeking?"). This text requires the interchange of two words (  $\text{וְיִזְכֹּר}$  and  $\text{וְיִזְכֹּר}$  ) and the regrouping of the initial  $\text{ו}$  with the  $\text{וְיִזְכֹּר}$  ("seed") instead of  $\text{וְיִזְכֹּר}$  ("to seek"). Moreover, it also requires the deletion of a  $\text{ה}$

<sup>1</sup>Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

<sup>2</sup>Vollers, (*op. cit.*, I, p. 243), "MT wurde vermutlich aus ästhetisch-theologischen Gründen geändert."

<sup>3</sup>So Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

<sup>4</sup>"This is unquestionably the most difficult v. in Mal.;" (Smith, Ward, Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 59).

<sup>5</sup>Bagster, *op. cit.*, p. 1129.

<sup>6</sup>G.R. Driver (*op. cit.*, p. 399) suggests this emended text which follows both the Arabic V and the Septuagint.



(and a 7?) as a dittograph and the substitution (or misreading) of an 7 for a 7.

The evidence is just as strong that the Masoretic Text was altered as that the Septuagint was changed. Riesseler<sup>1</sup> proposed the text: מה-אחר מורע מנקט אלהים<sup>2</sup> ("What other than a seed is God seeking?). This proposal also requires that an extra 7 be added. This textual emendation and G. R. Driver's<sup>3</sup> emendation both assume that the Septuagint here represents the original Hebrew text. If this assumption is correct, then it is likely that the Masoretic Text has been altered on theological grounds<sup>4</sup>.

(7) HABAKKUK 1:5

כי-על על בימיכם

For, behold, a work shall be wrought in your days,<sup>5</sup>

*not a translation of MT. Prob. 'one works'.*

<sup>1</sup>According to Driver (loc. cit.).

<sup>2</sup>Follows the Septuagint and Arabic V (so Driver, loc. cit.).

<sup>3</sup>The investigator's suggested text for the Septuagint is the same text as Driver's suggested emendation; see footnote 6, page 172.

<sup>4</sup>Driver (op. cit., pp. 399f.) suggests that the מבקש ("seeking") arose from an original scribal omission of a ורע which then was added incorrectly after the verb. This could be true, and the theological motive could explain why the scribe (or scribal group) did not correct his text. This unintentional alteration would easily suggest the change of a 7 into a 7 and the doubling, if necessary, of the 7 in ומה ("and what").

<sup>5</sup>American Jewish Translation.

διότι ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι<sup>1</sup>  
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν

For in your days I am  
doing a work. . .<sup>2</sup>

The translation of  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("working") by  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("I am working") suggests the possibility that the Septuagint translator read a text in which  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("I am working") occurred. This reading requires the addition of an  $\alpha$ . The context indicates, according to Stonehouse<sup>3</sup>, that the subject of the participle  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("working") should be the first person singular pronoun expressed or implicitly understood. Other scholars<sup>4</sup> consider that a third person singular noun or pronoun, expressed or implicitly understood, is the subject of  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("working"). If the latter assumption is correct, this investigator agrees with the American Jewish Translator(s) that the subject, he (she, it), cannot refer to Deity in this context. Since the speaker of this verse is probably God Himself<sup>5</sup>, the subject of  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  ("working") must be either God, i.e., a first person singular subject, or the

<sup>1</sup> $\sigma'$  = quia opus fiet in diebus vestris.

<sup>2</sup>Apparently the Revised Standard Version followed the Septuagint here because its translation reads: "For I am doing a work in your days".

<sup>3</sup>v. 6a as it now stands would point to the 1st pers. sing. as the subject of  $\epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ; some scholars, however, would understand the 3rd pers. sing. as subject, 'He worketh', viz. Jehovah; or the subject might possibly be indefinite, 'one worketh' (so R. Vm.), but the indefinite use of the participle in the singular is quite exceptional." (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 166).

<sup>4</sup>E.g., Ewald, Nowack, (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 166), the translators of the American Jewish Translation, et al.

<sup>5</sup>Wade, op. cit., p. 174.

noun, עֲמַל ("work"), a third person singular subject.

The former assumption is more probable, and consequently, the  $\alpha$  in the Masoretic Text perhaps was omitted because of a theological bias. Of course, the Greek translation may represent only an attempt made by the translator in his rendering to restore the original text (or meaning).

## 5. ANTHROPOPATHISMS IN THE SEPTUAGINT

In the Greek translation of the Twelve at least four passages are more anthropopathic than the Masoretic Text.

### (1) MALACHI 2:17

The translation of this passage may be anti-anthropomorphic; the translator may have softened the anthropomorphism to an anthropopathism. This passage has been discussed earlier (see pages 48f.).

### (2) HABAKKUK 2:4

הִנֵּה נִפְּחָה נַפְשׁוֹ  
וְיָשָׁר בּוֹ

Behold, his soul is  
puffed up, it is not  
upright in him;<sup>2</sup>

εάν υποστείληται οὐκ  
εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου  
ἐν αὐτῷ<sup>3</sup>

If any one draw back  
my soul hath no  
pleasure in him.

<sup>1</sup>Occurs only here (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 191).

<sup>2</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>3</sup>α' = ἰδοὺ νωχελευομένου οὐκ εὐθεῖα ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ.

The translation of לֹא-יֵשְׂרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ ("his soul is not upright in him") by οὐκ εὐδοκᾷ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ ("My soul has no pleasure in him") is of particular interest because the Septuagint has changed a statement which did not refer to God into one which does refer to God and is both anthropomorphic ( ἡ ψυχὴ μου - "my soul") and anthropopathic ( εὐδοκᾷ - "has pleasure").

Several commentators<sup>1</sup> consider that the Masoretic Text does not represent the original Hebrew. Therefore, some delete certain words<sup>2</sup>; others emend the text<sup>3</sup>, following the Septuagint which may translate a text like, e.g., הִנֵּה נַפְשִׁי בּוֹ<sup>4</sup> . Probably the translator had (or read) a text differing little from the Masoretic Text, e.g., הִנֵּה נַפְשִׁי בִּי<sup>5</sup>, in which the הִנֵּה was understood to introduce the protasis of a conditional sentence and the יֵשְׂרָה was (mis-)understood to have the figurative meaning of "be pleasing with"<sup>6</sup>. This text would explain easily both the difficult Masoretic Text and the translation of the Septuagint<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Stonehouse (op. cit., p. 193), Procksch (op. cit., p. 947, footnote), et al.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Stonehouse (op. cit., p. 192).

<sup>3</sup>E.g., Procksch (op. cit., p. 947, footnote).

<sup>4</sup>So Procksch (loc. cit.) and Marti (according to Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 191).

<sup>5</sup>Stonehouse, loc. cit.

<sup>6</sup>The construction must be different (Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 191f).

<sup>7</sup>A textual difference only of an ם for a ן.

## (3) HOSEA 11:7

וַאֲלֵ-לָעַל יִקְרָאוּ

And though they call  
them upwards,<sup>1</sup>καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὰ τιμῶν  
αὐτοῦ θυμωθήσεται<sup>2</sup>. . . will God be  
provoked against his  
honours. . .

"The meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain,"<sup>3</sup> and the Targum is not helpful, although it probably translates a text similar to the Masoretic Text. The other versions are not too helpful. The only certain fact is that the Septuagint<sup>4</sup> is anthropopathic, whereas the Masoretic Text is not. Perhaps this may be a "splendid example of a miserable text and a defenseless exegesis"<sup>5</sup>.

## (4) MALACHI 2:13

וְזֶאת שְׁנִיָּה תַעֲשׂוּ<sup>6</sup>

And this again you do.

---

<sup>1</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>2</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 907 footnote) suggests that the Septuagint read וַאֲלֵ-לָעַל יִקְרָאוּ; Harper (op. cit., p. 365) suggests that the Septuagint read יִקְרָאוּ. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 89) suggests, וַאֲלֵ-לָעַל יִקְרָאוּ.

<sup>3</sup>Revised Standard Version, p. 944 footnote d.

<sup>4</sup>"It is clear that the LXX. had a quite different text" from the Masoretic Text (Scott, op. cit., p. 146).

<sup>5</sup>Nyberg (op. cit., p. 89), " . . . prachtvolle Beispiele eines elenden Texts und einer hilflosen Exegese."

<sup>6</sup>The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.



καὶ ταῦτα α ἐμισουν<sup>1</sup>  
ἐποιεῖτε<sup>2</sup>

Moreover you have done  
those things which I  
hate.

The translation of  $\alpha \epsilon \mu \iota \sigma \upsilon \nu$  ("secondly") by  $\alpha \epsilon \mu \iota \sigma \upsilon \nu$  ("which I hate") may suggest that the translator had (or misread) a text with two  $\omega$ , and the  $\nu$  as following the  $\alpha$ . The translation is anthropopathic, as opposed to the Masoretic Text which avoids the anthropopathism and also softens the complaint against Israel.

The Septuagint seemingly translates the original Hebrew text accurately in many instances. In several passages it is uncertain whether the Masoretic Text or the Septuagint represents the original Hebrew text. In a few passages the Masoretic Text is preferable to the Septuagint.

#### 6. PASSAGES WHICH, IN THE MASORETIC TEXT, AVOID DESCRIBING GOD AS MOVING BUT WHICH, IN THE SEPTUAGINT, ASCRIBE MOTION TO DEITY

There are a few places<sup>3</sup> where the Septuagint describes God as moving about and the Masoretic Text does not.

##### (1) AMOS 2:13

<sup>1</sup>I.e.,  $\nu \alpha \nu \nu \nu$  ("Which I hate") according to Horst (Robinson and Horst, *op. cit.*, p. 260), Procksch (*op. cit.*, p. 974, footnote); cf. Marti (*op. cit.*, p. 470), Wutz (*op. cit.*, p. 344), Cheyne (*op. cit.*, pp. 195f), Smith (J.M.P.), Winkler, Budde (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, *op. cit.*, pp. 58f), et al.

<sup>2</sup> $\alpha', \sigma', \theta'$  = καὶ τοῦτο ( $\sigma', \tau \alpha \upsilon \tau \alpha$ ) δευτερον ("And this further").

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Zechariah 9:6, page 98 and Haggai 1:11, page 64.

אֶנְכִּי יַדְבִּיק אֶתְּךָ<sup>1</sup>

I will press<sup>2</sup> you down  
• • •

ἐγὼ κυλίω ὑποκάτω ὑμῶν<sup>3</sup>

I will roll under you,

Both the Hebrew and the Greek passages are anthropomorphic, but the Greek translation describes God in motion, whereas the Hebrew does not. No final conclusion, however, may be reached concerning this text and its translation by the Septuagint.

(2) MICAH 5:12(11)<sup>4</sup>

וְהִכָּתִיתִי<sup>5</sup>

And I will [cause to be]  
cut off . . .

καὶ ἐξαρῶ<sup>6</sup>

And I will carry off. .  
•<sup>7</sup>

This translation is uncertain since many manuscripts and versions<sup>8</sup> translate in a way which does not impute motion to Deity. Since the Septuagint (or a Greek trans-

---

<sup>1</sup>See Harper (*op. cit.*, pp. 62f) for a discussion of the difficulties connected with the meanings of this verb. Hence, no conclusion can be reached from the Greek translation.

<sup>2</sup>The Targum's "I will afflict you" supports the Masoretic Text.

<sup>3</sup>α' = τριζήσω ὑποκάτω ὑμῶν.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Hosea 2:4(2); see pages 170ff.

<sup>5</sup>Another hiphil.

<sup>6</sup>Or ἐξολοθρεύσω ("I will utterly destroy"); cf. B - 68, L<sup>1</sup>-36 86<sup>mg</sup> 407, La<sup>cs</sup>, Co, Tht., W (vid.), A<sup>1</sup>- 233' 538', Aeth<sup>p</sup>, Arm.

<sup>7</sup>A free translation.

<sup>8</sup>See footnote 6 above.

lation) originally may have translated the Hebrew **וְהִכָּתִיתִי** ("and I will cause to be cut off") as **καὶ ἐξαρώ** ("and I will carry off"), the rendering is especially significant because in the preceding verse the same Hebrew word is rendered in the same manuscripts as **καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω** ("And I will destroy").

(3) MICAH 7:3

**וַיִּבְנוּ**

Thus they weave it together.

**καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι (τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν)**

. . . therefore I will take away (their good things,). . .

The Septuagint represents a Hebrew text such as, **וַיִּבְנוּ** <sup>1</sup> (or **וַיִּבְנוּ** <sup>2</sup>). Taylor, however, considers that the use of the first person singular by the Septuagint ". . . can only be looked on as a conscious correction made in order to harmonize with the following part of the translation."<sup>3</sup> The Targum here is a translation of **וַיִּבְנוּ** <sup>4</sup>; the other versions differ considerably in their translation of **וַיִּבְנוּ**. G. R. Driver<sup>5</sup> emends the Masoretic Text to **וַיִּבְנוּ** <sup>6</sup> **וַיִּבְנוּ** ("but he loathes their goodness as a

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, op. cit., p. 163.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit., footnote †.

<sup>3</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>4</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup>Driver, op. cit., p. 268.

<sup>6</sup>Septuagint: **τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν** ("their good things"); cf. the Syriac and Arabic V.

brier,"). No final conclusions may be drawn from a situation like this.

(4) HABAKKUK 3:13

תָּרַס-רַג רִגְלֵי מִגְרָג<sup>1</sup>

. . . laying him bare  
from thigh to neck.<sup>2</sup>

εξηγειρας δεσμούς εως  
τραχηλου<sup>3</sup>

. . . thou hast raised  
chains up to the neck.

The Greek translation corresponds to a Hebrew text, such as, תָּרַס-רַג מִגְרָג מִגְרָג<sup>4</sup>, which differs little from the Masoretic Text. Therefore, the translator may have misread his text or possessed one which differed from the Masoretic Text.

---

In the first example (Amos 2:13) the Septuagint clearly depicts God as moving, but in the last three (especially the last one) the concept of motion is not so clearly evident. "To carry off" implies motion, but the idea of motion is not as pronounced in "to take away" and "to raise up".

---

<sup>1</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 949, footnote) emends following the Septuagint.

<sup>2</sup>The Hebrew is obscure (Revised Standard Version, p. 977, footnote 1).

<sup>3</sup>θ' = ornasti fundamentum usque ad collum.

<sup>4</sup>So Procksch, op. cit., p. 949, footnote.

7. PASSAGES IN WHICH THE MASORETIC TEXT, MORE THAN  
THE SEPTUAGINT, SAFEGUARDS THE CONCEPT OF  
GOD'S CHARACTER, ETC.

In these passages the Septuagint is more derogatory  
of the character of Deity than the Masoretic Text.

(1) HOSEA 10:15

ככה עשה לכם בת-אל

So hath Beth-el done unto  
you. . .<sup>1</sup>

οὕτως ποιήσω ὑμῖν  
οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ

In this manner I will  
deal with you, O house  
of Israel,

The Septuagint represents a text as ככה מעשה  
("Thus I will do to you, O house of Israel").

Procksch<sup>2</sup> considers that here the Septuagint translates the  
original Hebrew text. This statement easily may be true  
since the Septuagint's translation would be objectionable  
for two reasons: (1) the translation in this context is  
derogatory of God's character and (2) it would be objection-  
able to the pride of an Israelite. The Masoretic Text could  
represent easily an attempt to soften the statement.

(2) JOEL 4(3):4

ואם-בשלמים אתם עלי

If you are paying me  
back,

<sup>1</sup>American Jewish Translation; cf. the Revised Standard  
Version's, "Thus it will be done to you, O house of Israel,"  
(p. 943).

<sup>2</sup>Procksch, op. cit., p. 906, footnotes.



η μνησικαχειτε υμεις  
επ' εμοι α ξεως

Or are you venting your  
spite against me?

Although the Masoretic Text is anthropomorphic, the Septuagint is more offensive because Israel is depicted as bearing malice against God. Either the Masoretic Text or the Septuagint may represent the original Hebrew text.

(3) ZEPHANIAH 1:9

וְהַמְלִיטִים בֵּית אֱלֹהֵיהֶם  
בְּכַזָּב וּבְחִלּוּל

. . . and those who fill  
their master's house with  
violence and fraud.

τους πληρουντας τον  
οικον κυριου<sup>1</sup> του  
θεου αυτων<sup>2</sup> ασεβειας<sup>3</sup>  
και δολου

. . . them who fill the  
house of the Lord their  
God with impiety and  
deceit.

The Septuagint by the addition of κυριου ("Lord") makes an offensive statement. Certainly if the Masoretes (or an earlier scribal school) found a text like וְהַמְלִיטִים בֵּית אֱלֹהֵיהֶם ("house of the Lord their God"), the omission of אֱלֹהֵיהֶם would be suggested readily as a means of eliminating the offensive statement. On the other hand the Septuagint does not necessarily require a different text. The Greek translator may have translated וְהַמְלִיטִים ("their master") by

*But wd. Κυριου not be a natural transl. even if ref. were not to God?*

<sup>1</sup>V L<sup>36</sup> - 86 - 407 106 Cyr.<sup>comm</sup> Th. Tht. omit κυριου .

<sup>2</sup>46<sup>1</sup> C-68 Syh. et al. omit all or a portion of του θεου αυτων.

<sup>3</sup>A<sup>1</sup> - 49 Bas. N. read ανομιας.

κυριου <sup>1</sup> ("Lord") because he considered their real master to be Yahweh and, therefore, added θεου αυτων ("their God") for clarity. Alternatively, he may have considered that deceitful and violent action against rulers and masters is in reality directed against God Himself.

(4) JOEL 3(4):21

יִתְּנִי-אֵל מִדָּם יִתְּנִי

I will hold innocent  
their blood which I have  
not held innocent<sup>2</sup>. . .

και εκζητησω<sup>3</sup> [εχ-  
δικησω] το αιμα αυτων  
και ου μη αθωωσω

. . . and I will seek  
out<sup>4</sup> [make inquisition]  
for their blood, and will  
not pass over it un-  
revenged;

The Septuagint softens this statement of God, Procksch considers the Syriac and Septuagint to represent the original text and emends the Masoretic Text to: יִתְּנִי<sup>5</sup> אֵל מִדָּם . On the other hand, one must note that elsewhere the Septuagint does not translate יִתְּנִי ("to hold innocent") by either εκζητω ("to seek out") or εκδικεω ("to punish")<sup>6</sup>. Moreover, the Syriac and the Septuagint

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint of the Twelve always translates יְיָ ("lord, master") by κυριος ("lord").

<sup>2</sup>Revised Standard Version footnote g, p. 951; cf. the American Jewish Translation.

<sup>3</sup>Against Ziegler; following B-S-V Q<sup>c</sup> L<sup>v</sup> - 407<sup>mg</sup> C<sup>v</sup> - 68 - 239 - 534 La<sup>s</sup> Th. Tht. Hi.

<sup>4</sup>Translating the εκζητησω .

<sup>5</sup>Procksch, op. cit., p. 916, footnotes.

<sup>6</sup>So Driver, op. cit., pp. 401 f.

support the Masoretic Text in the second  $\pi p_1$ . Hence G. R. Driver's<sup>1</sup> suggestion that  $\pi p_1$  is used here in an original meaning of pouring out, especially of sacrificial libations. The root could have developed easily the meaning of "to sacrifice" and, finally, "to be right, pure". Hence, Driver suggests the meaning of the Hebrew to be, "'and I will pour out their blood (which) I have not poured out', i.e. I will destroy those whom I have hitherto not destroyed. . . The renderings of the Vss. will then be due partly to ignorance of this meaning of the root and partly to misunderstanding the rather strong anthropomorphism;"<sup>2</sup>.

## (5) NAHUM 1:9

וְיִשְׁפֹּךְ יְהוָה  
 בְּצָרָה

. . . he will not rise up<sup>4</sup>  
 twice on his distress<sup>5</sup>.

οὐκ ἐχδικήσει<sup>7</sup> δις  
 ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν θλίψει<sup>6</sup>

. . . and (He will) not  
 punish twice by distress  
 for the same thing.

<sup>1</sup>Driver, op. cit., p. 402.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup>G.R. Driver (op. cit., p. 269) follows the Masoretic Text but rearranges the text considerably.

<sup>4</sup>Following Revised Standard Version, p. 972 footnote  
 b.

<sup>5</sup>Following Revised Standard Version, p. 972, footnote  
 c.

<sup>6</sup>ἐχδικήσει =  $\pi p_1$  (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 942 footnote).  $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is added by 1 II Or.<sup>lat</sup> VI 451.

<sup>7</sup> $\sigma'$  = οὐκ υπομενουςι την επαναστασιν δευτερας θλιψεως;  
 $\theta'$  = οὐκ αναστησεται δευτερον θλιψις.

The Septuagint implies that God might perform an action which would reflect unfavorably on His character, and the Masoretic Text may represent an attempt to avoid this offensive implication.

---

Only in Hosea 10:15 is the Septuagint more probably a translation of the original Hebrew text, although this likewise may be true of the translation of Joel 4(3):4 (and 21?). In the other passages, the Masoretic translation seems to represent the original text as accurately as does the Septuagint.

X                      X                      X                      X                      X

Quite a few passages have been considered in which the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text, passages in which the Septuagint ascribes motion to Deity, or in some way is more derogatory of God's character, etc.

In several instances, the Septuagint version is definitely to be preferred to the Masoretic Text; in others it is possibly preferable. In a few passages there seems to be no choice between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint, and, in the remaining, the Masoretic Text is to be preferred to the Septuagint.

## 8. CONCLUSION

In Section II, "The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the

Septuagint", (Chapters II, III and IV), more than one hundred instances of possible anthropomorphisms in the Septuagint have been discussed. In about nineteen percent<sup>1</sup> of the passages discussed, this investigator considers that the Septuagint translation is either probably or possibly<sup>2</sup> anti-anthropomorphic. In respect to about twenty-four percent<sup>1</sup> of the Septuagint passages under consideration the conclusion was reached that very probably the Septuagint is not <sup>anti-?</sup> anthropomorphic. The Septuagint translations of approximately another forty-two percent<sup>1</sup> of the passages considered were, in the opinion of this investigator, dependent upon different or misread texts<sup>3</sup> or else upon texts which were vocalized<sup>4</sup> differently <sup>from</sup> than the Masoretic Text. The remaining approximately seventeen percent<sup>1</sup> of the passages considered include passages in which the translator used the wrong Hebrew root (about two percent), passages where the Septuagint translation is considered to represent the original Hebrew text (four percent), and passages concerning whose translation no fairly certain conclusions could be reached (about eleven percent).

---

<sup>1</sup>These percentages are accurate only to the closest whole figure. Consequently, they total one hundred two percent.

<sup>2</sup>About half were considered probable and half only possible.

<sup>3</sup>Approximately thirty-seven percent.

<sup>4</sup>Approximately five percent.



In Chapter V of Section II passages have been considered in which the Septuagint translation appears to be more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text. In forty-five percent<sup>1</sup> of these passages it seems possible, or even probable<sup>2</sup>, that the Septuagint translates the original Hebrew text. In seventeen percent<sup>1</sup> of the forty-two passages the original Hebrew seems to have been as faithfully preserved in the Masoretic Text as in the Septuagint. As to twenty-two percent<sup>1</sup> of these forty-two passages the conclusion was reached that the Septuagint translation did not represent an anthropomorphism in the original Hebrew Text. Regarding the remaining nineteen percent <sup>1</sup> of these passages no final conclusion could be reached.

These figures prove conclusively the impossibility of demonstrating that the Septuagint translation of the Book of the Twelve exhibits an anti-anthropomorphic tendency. In fact, it might be easier to establish an anthropomorphic tendency rather than the reverse. Only if Kahle's<sup>3</sup> theory can be established, viz. that the Septuagint was translated in segments like the Targums, would it be reasonable to maintain that the Septuagint of the Twelve has an anti-

---

<sup>1</sup>These percentages are computed to the closest whole numbers; they total one hundred three percent.

<sup>2</sup>About one-half were considered to be probable and one half, possible.

<sup>3</sup>And others.

anthropomorphic tendency<sup>1</sup>. Otherwise, the results of this investigation are opposed to this assumption.

Of course, this examination of the possible anti-anthropomorphisms of the Septuagint translation of the Twelve does not establish conclusively that there are no anti-anthropomorphisms in this section of the Septuagint. The conclusion, however, has been reached by this investigator that neither the existence nor the non-existence of anti-anthropomorphisms, in the portion of the Septuagint examined, can be proved.

---

<sup>1</sup>After this dissertation was in final form, an article appeared which stated that a Greek text of the Minor Prophets has recently been discovered "which deftly solves some of the most baffling problems in the history of the Greek Text of the Old Testament." (Frank M. Cross, Jr., "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves", *The Biblical Archaeologist* XVII (1954), p. 12). This find, according to Frank Cross, supports the Proto-Septuagint school and opposes the school that considers the "Septuagint" merely to be one of many Greek translations which floated about. Apparently, it also raises difficulties for those who adhere to the segment-theory because he concludes with the statement: "In short the new Greek version solves many problems for the 'Proto-Septuagint' school of thought, and raises grave difficulties for defenders of alternate views." (*ibid.*, p. 13).

SECTION III.

THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE  
TARGUM TO THE TWELVE



## CHAPTER VI

### THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE TARGUM<sup>1</sup> TO THE TWELVE<sup>2</sup>: THE GROSSER ANTHROPOMORPHISMS

Investigators have assumed that the Targums<sup>3</sup> (and the Septuagint) exhibit an anti-anthropomorphic tendency. Certainly this is a very plausible assumption, yet, apparently, no one has investigated this field thoroughly enough to prove such statements as, for example, Thackeray's "The Targums, . . . emphasize the transcendence of the Deity; everything in the text that implies direct communion between God and man or attributes human action or properties to God is eliminated, toned down or explained away; an intermediary

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum of Jonathan to the Prophets.

<sup>2</sup>Unless otherwise indicated by the context or mentioned, "The Targum" alone, will mean "The Targum of Jonathan to the Twelve Prophets".

<sup>3</sup>" . . . in the Targums a very pronounced transcendentalism is taught; so much so that the thought of divine working in the hearts of men directly seems to be almost entirely eliminated. Moreover, this one-sided doctrine of God is in so far antagonistic to the Old Testament teaching in that it altogether does away with the belief in God as the God of history; . . . In accordance with this teaching the Targums avoid everything that appears to savour of anthropomorphism and implies any direct personal communion between God and man;" (Oesterly, W. O. E., and Box, G. H., A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920), pp. 46f.); "Jonathan umgehet wie Onkelos und zuweilen weiter als Onkelos jede Aussage, die dem Gottesbegriffe nicht angemessen." (Fränkel, Z., "Zu dem Targum der Propheten" Jahresbericht des jüdischtheologischen Seminar (Breslau: F. W. Jungfer's Buchdruckerei, 1872), p. 21); see also Deutsch, E., Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch (London: John Murray, 1874), pp. 364-380 and footnote 2, page 33, chapter 2. 29/

agent is constantly interposed."<sup>1</sup>

Even though this hypothesis is much more self-evident for the Targums than for the Septuagint, there are instances of anthropomorphisms being retained<sup>2</sup>, and some places where the Targums appear to be more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text<sup>3</sup>.

The two most valuable works on this subject are the article, "Die Anthropomorphisms in den Thargumim", by Ginsburger in the Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie (1891) and the book on the Targum of Jonathan to the Prophets by Churgin<sup>4</sup>, published in 1927<sup>5</sup>. Ginsburger classifies his various paraphrases of the anthropomorphisms into three sections: the oldest, the later, and the youngest paraphrases. Of these only the first two are pertinent to this investigation<sup>6</sup>. Churgin is somewhat broader in his scope but is much less complete than Ginsburger in the material covered. Both men, however, fail to discuss the material completely.

---

<sup>1</sup>Thackeray, op. cit., p. 37.

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix VII, p. 407ff.

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix VII.

<sup>4</sup>Churgin, Pinkhos, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927), p. 152. Yale Oriental Series -- Researches XIV.

<sup>5</sup>Misprinted in book as 1907.

<sup>6</sup>Indicated in the body and footnotes of this dissertation by the letters E (oldest) and L (later).



## 1. THE ASCRIPTION TO DEITY OF HUMAN(PHYSICAL) FORM

If the thesis is to be firmly established that the Targum eliminates, tones down, or explains away the ascribing of human action or properties to God, the Targum then must eliminate or modify all (or at least most of) the passages which imply or state that God is a man or even compare God to a man. To a certain extent the Targum of the Twelve modifies or eliminates these offensive anthropomorphisms.

Many passages containing terms which infer<sup>1</sup> that God is a man are modified. Even the statements which negate the idea that God is a man undergo alteration.

(1) HOSEA 2:4(2)<sup>2</sup>

וְאֵנִי לֹא אִשָּׁה

. . . and I am not her husband --

וּמִימְרֵי לֹא מִקְבִּיל  
צְלוּחָהּ. . . and My Word<sup>3</sup> does not accept (receive) her prayers --

The Targum's rendering here is not clear; perhaps

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Malachi 3:17. Here the clause וְחָמְלָהּ עֲלֵיהֶם ("and I will spare them as a man spares his son who serves him.") is translated as וְאִיחֹס עֲלֵיהֶן כְּמֵא רַחִים נֹכַח עַל בְּרִיָּה דְפִלָּה יִחְיֶה ("and I will spare them as a man spares his son who serves him"). In this instance the comparison is retained; cf. the Septuagint (see page 39, footnote 2).

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint here translates literally; see page 38, footnote 3.

<sup>3</sup>מִימְרֵי ("My Word") may indicate either a paraphrastic, allegorical interpretation, representing אִשָּׁה ("her husband"), or, preferably, as Ginsburger, it may stand for the personal pronoun, אֲנִי ("I").

ומימרי ("and My Word") translates ואנכי ("and I"), and צלוה ("her prayers") is substituted for אישה ("her husband"). The מקביל ("accepts") has been added as a result of the translator's choice of Aramaic words to represent צלוה ("her prayers") and אישה ("her husband").

(2) HOSEA 11:9

<sup>1</sup>כי אל אנכי ולא-איש

. . . for I am God and not man,

ארי אלהא אנא <sup>2</sup>מימרי  
לעלם קיים וליה עובדי  
כעובדי בני ביסרא דירין  
על ארעא

Because I am God. My Word endures forever, and My works are not as the works of the sons of flesh who dwell upon the earth.

This translation is obviously not literal but a paraphrastic rendering which adds an emphatic note to more definitely emphasize the difference between God and man. This passage and the preceding one are excellent examples of the lengths to which the targumist went in order to avoid any possible implication that God might be human.

(3) HOSEA 11:4 E

ואהיה לחם כמרימי על על  
להיהם

. . . and I became to them as one who eases the yoke on their jaws,

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint translates literally; see page 38, footnote 1.

<sup>2</sup>Apparently Memra has been added here and the negative deleted because the targumist was offended by the suggestion that anyone could conceive even of the possibility that God could be human.

וְהוּא מִימְרֵי לִהְיוֹן  
כְּאִיכְרָא טַבָּא דְמַקְלִיל  
בְּכַתֵּף תּוֹרִיא

. . . and My Word will  
be to them as a good  
farm-hand who is lax with  
the shoulders of oxen,

מִימְרֵי ("My Word") here cannot be a translation of the personal pronoun, although it is obviously a paraphrase for God. The translation completely avoids the anthropomorphism of the Masoretic Text<sup>1</sup>, yet the Targum reflects a Hebrew text which is essentially the same as our Masoretic Text.

(4) HOSEA 2:25(23)

וְזָרַעְתִּיהָ לִּי

. . . and I will sow her<sup>2</sup>  
for myself. . .

וְאִיקְיִמִּינוּן קֶרְמִי  
(בְּאֶרֶץ בֵּית שְׁכִינָה)

. . . and I will establish  
them before me (in the land  
of the house of My Shekinah).<sup>3</sup>

The Targum here clearly is dependant upon a Hebrew text similar to the Masoretic Text. The problem in connection with this passage arises principally because the same verb (זָרַע = "to sow, scatter") occurs also in Zechariah 10:9 where the Targum translates literally -- although perhaps in

<sup>1</sup>This passage illustrates clearly the difference between the Targum and the Septuagint. The Targum here is anti-anthropomorphic whereas the Septuagint increases the anthropomorphism; see page 161f.

<sup>2</sup>Following the Revised Standard Version footnote j, page 937. Procksch (op. cit., p. 897, footnote) emends the text to לִי וְזָרַעְתִּיהָ ("and I will sow him for myself"); the Revised Standard Version in its text follows the same emendation. The Septuagint literally translates the Hebrew as καὶ σπερῶ αὐτὴν ἐμαυτῷ ("I will plant her for myself. . .").

<sup>3</sup>This translation conveys the basic idea of the Hebrew.

this latter instance the targumist may have read a different verb<sup>1</sup>.

ואזרעם בעמים<sup>2</sup>

Though I scattered  
[sowed] them among the  
nations,

וכמא דבררתינון ביני  
עממא

. . . and as I have  
scattered them among the  
nations,

The inconsistency of translation suggests that the translation in Hosea 2:25(23) is not an anti-anthropomorphism, but that the translator may have selected a different verb, קום ("to establish"), merely to emphasize his interpretation of the passage. The difficulty of understanding the motive of the targumist may be seen by observing the translations of the remaining occurrences of זרע ("to sow") in the Twelve:

[1] HOSEA 10:12

<sup>1</sup>So Jansma (op. cit., p. 89).

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint renders the Hebrew literally as και σπερω αυτους εν λαοις ("and I will sow them among (the) people"). One manuscript (86<sup>mg</sup>) translates the verb as επεγερω ("I will raise up"). See page 41. Perhaps this manuscript exhibits a pro-Israel bias.

<sup>3</sup>With this possible exception, the verb זרע ("to sow, scatter") never elsewhere is used of the dispersion in an unfavorable sense (so Wright, op. cit., pp. 285f). Moreover, usually (never elsewhere, according to Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 301) this verb is not used of scattering human beings (cf. Hosea 2:25[23] above). The usual verb is זרה, and, therefore, Wellhausen, Nowack, Smith (G.A.), perhaps Mitchel (loc. cit.), and Oort (op. cit., p. 149) emend the Masoretic Text to ואזרם. Jansma (op. cit., p. 89) agrees that the Targum read a form of זרה.

זרעו לכם לצדקה	Sow for yourselves righteousness,
בית ישראל עיבדו לכון צוברים מבין	O house of Israel, work for yourselves good works,

y/

## [2] HOSEA 8:7

כי רוח יזרעו	For they sow the wind,
בית ישראל דמן לדרוח זרע	The house of Israel is like to a scattering wind [to that which a wind scatters].

## [3] NAHUM 1:14

לא-יזרע משמך עוד <sup>1</sup>	No more shall your name be perpetuated;
ולא יהי דוכרן משמך עוד	. . . and there will be no longer a record of your name;

In the remaining two passages the Hebrew is translated literally. Thus, the verb ( זרע = "to sow, scatter") sometimes is translated literally and other times more freely. This inconsistency makes it difficult to discover an anti-anthropomorphic pattern in the Targum's rendering of the verb זרע ("to sow"). Since, however, this can mean "scatter" in both the Hebrew and the Aramaic, perhaps the concept of God as sowing was considered only to mean that God scatters. This concept would be less anthropomorphic.

## (5) AMOS 9:15

---

<sup>1</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 943, footnote) emends to  
לא יזכר עוד ("Your name will be remembered no  
longer").



וְנִטְעֵהֶם אֶל-אֲדָמָתָם

I will plant them upon  
their land,

וְאִיקִּימֵנִי עַל אֲרַעְהוֹן

. . . and I will establish  
them upon their land,

Although the Targum gives in its translation the essential meaning of the Hebrew, the rendering here is probably an anti-anthropomorphism. This verb ( נָטַע = "to plant") occurs three times in a non-theological sense (Amos 5:11; 9:14; Zephaniah 1:13), and in each instance the verb is translated literally. Therefore, especially since נָטַע ("to plant") is rendered literally in Amos 9:14, the translation of נָטַע ("to plant") by קִיּוּם ("to establish") in Amos 9:15 arose probably because of an anti-anthropomorphic bias of the translator.

## (6) GOD PICTURED AS FEEDING OR TENDING

The treatment in the Targum of the passages which describe God as feeding or tending (as a shepherd) is obscure. In Micah 7:14 and Hosea 4:16 the reference to God as feeding ( רָעָה ) is clear, but in four places in the eleventh chapter of Zechariah the actor (subject) of רָעָה ("to feed, tend") is not so certain.

## [1] MICAH 7:14

רָעָה עִמָּךְ בְּשֹׁבֶטךָ

Shepherd thy people with  
thy staff,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint translates literally as ποιμαίνε λαόν σου ("Feed thou thy people. . .").

פרנס עמך במימך

Sustain Your people by  
Your Word.

## [2] HOSEA 4:16

עַתָּה יִרְעֶם יְהוָה<sup>1</sup>. . . can the Lord now  
feed them. . .

כֵּעַן יִדְבִּירֵנוּן יְהוָה

Now Yahweh will lead  
them. . .

The translation of רעה ("feed") by דבר ("lead") is scarcely anti-anthropomorphic, since רעה also means "to shepherd". Therefore, "to lead" is an adequate rendering of that idea. In the passages in Zechariah and also in Micah 5:6(5) the verb רעה is interpreted in the Targum as meaning "to rule, govern", a legitimate meaning. In most of the remaining occurrences of רעה ("to feed, shepherd") in non-theological passages, except for the qal active participle used as a substantive, this verb is translated by פרנס ("to endow, provide, sustain, cultivate") as occurs in the theological passage (Micah 7:14) above. In three passages, however, a different verb occurs: (1) in Jonah 3:7, רעי ("to feed, tend"); (2) in Hosea 9:2, יון ("to support, nourish"), and (3) in Hosea 12:2(1) where

אֶפְרַיִם רֵעָה רוּחַ

Ephraim herds [feeds<sup>2</sup>  
on] the wind,

is softened to

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint translates accurately: οὗτος τρεφεῖ αὐτοὺς κυρίως (" . . . the Lord will now feed them. . .").

<sup>2</sup>Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 945.

בית ישראל דמן לדרוח  
זרע

. . . the house of Israel  
is like to a scattering  
wind. . .

This last passage in the Targum may reflect the influence of an earlier translation in Hosea 8:7<sup>1</sup>.

[3] HOSEA 11:4

ואם אליו אוכיל

. . . and I bent down to  
them and fed them.

ואף כד חוו במדברא  
אפניתי להון טובא<sup>2</sup>  
למיכל

. . . and also when they  
were in the wilderness, I  
multiplied to them good  
things to eat.

This is the only remaining passage where God is said to feed anyone in the Twelve. Since this translation retains the essential idea of the Hebrew, it may not be an anti-anthropomorphic softening<sup>3</sup>.

(7) GOD AS ISRAEL'S HUSBAND

The description of the relationship between Israel and God as man and wife was much too anthropomorphic to be left unaltered in the Aramaic translation. One passage<sup>4</sup> has been discussed earlier in this chapter.

<sup>1</sup>See page 196.

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps the Targum read וא'מ' (so Ruben, op. cit., p. 19).

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint here differs considerably; see pages 42-43.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 2:4(2) E; see pages 192f.

[1] HOSEA 2:18(16) L<sup>1</sup>

חַקְרָאִי אִישִׁי וְלֹא־  
חַקְרָאִי־לִי עוֹד בְּעָלִי

. . . you will call me,  
'My husband', and no  
longer will you call me,  
'My Ba'al'.

חֲתַנְהוֹן לְפִלְחָנִי וְלֹא  
תַפְלַחוּן עוֹד לַמַּעֲוֹתָא

. . . you will follow  
eagerly My worship, and  
you will no longer serve  
idols.

The Targum avoids the anthropomorphism of אִישִׁי ("My Husband") by substituting לְפִלְחָנִי ("My worship"). The selection of חֲתַנְהוֹן לְפִלְחָנִי ("My worship") probably arose from the prophetic concept that for Israel to depart from serving the true God to serve idols was to behave towards Him as an idolatrous wife.

The change in the verbs from חַקְרָאִי ("You will call me") to חֲתַנְהוֹן ("You will follow eagerly") results naturally from the choice of לְפִלְחָנִי ("My worship"). The Targum here gives the meaning of the spiritual interpretation of this passage.

## [2] HOSEA 2:4(2) E

כִּי־הִיא לֹא אִשְׁתִּי<sup>3</sup>

. . . for she is not my  
wife,

אֲרִי הִיא לֹא מִתְעַנִּיָּא  
בְּפִלְחָנִי

Because she is not devoted  
to My worship. . .

<sup>1</sup>See page 278 and 328.

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint translates literally; see page 78, footnote 4.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint translates literally; see page 200, footnote 4.

This translation follows the same pattern of avoiding the anthropomorphism as Hosea 2:18(16) L. Here, however, **בפולחני** ("to My worship") translates not **אִישִׁי** ("My Husband") but **אִשְׁתִּי** ("My Wife"). The Targum reproduces the spiritual interpretation of the passage.

[3] HOSEA 2:9(7)

<sup>1</sup> ואשובה אל-אִישִׁי הראשון	... and [I will] return to my first husband,
<sup>2</sup> ואֵיחֻב <sup>2</sup> לפולחן רִיבוֹנִי קדמא	And [I will] return to the worship of my former lord (husband).

The translation of **אל-אִישִׁי הראשון** ("to my former husband"), by **לפולחן רִיבוֹנִי קדמא** ("to the worship of my former lord") varies the established pattern somewhat. Probably the idea of return to their former worship was too offensive for other reasons, e.g., cultic objections, pro-Israel bias, or the like. Moreover, such a statement fails to indicate clearly that Israel is returning to the worship of the true God, whereas by the addition of **רִיבוֹנִי** ("my lord") makes clear that Israel is returning to her former lord's worship, i.e., Yahweh.

[4] HOSEA 3:3

---

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint here translates literally; see page 38, footnote 3.

<sup>2</sup>Some manuscripts omit.



<sup>1</sup> ימים רבים חשבי לי

You must dwell as mine  
for many days;

יומין סניאין חחנהון  
לפולחני

Many days you will be  
given to My worship;

Usually Memra ( מִמְרָא ) is the device which the targumist uses to avoid the personal pronoun. Probably the allegorical interpretation of the preceding chapter is reflected in the translation of לי ("as mine") by לפולחני ("to my worship").

[5] HOSEA 2:21(19) f

The idea of God being betrothed to Israel, although this idea involves a concept similar to the wife-husband relationship, does not follow the above pattern.

<sup>2</sup> וארשתיך לי

. . . and I will betroth  
you to me. . .

ואיכיימינך קדמי

. . . and I will establish  
you before Me.

Perhaps because the degree of intimacy implied by bethrothal is less than that of marriage, פולחני ("My worship") is not used by the targumist.

(8) GOD'S SOUL (NEPHESEH)

---

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint translates literally here: *ἡμερας πολλας καθησθαι ἐπ' ἐμοι* ("Thou shalt continue many days for me . . .").

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint here is literal; see page 39, footnote 1.

The targumist, unlike the Septuagint translator<sup>1</sup>, clearly recognized the anthropomorphism<sup>2</sup> contained in the concept of God's nephesh (נפש). Hence, he altered the two passages in the Book of the Twelve where the concept is found. In each case he substituted Memra (מימרא).

[1] AMOS 6:8

נשבע אדני יהוה בנפשו <sup>3</sup>	The Lord God has sworn by Himself. . .
קיים יהוה אלהים במימרה	Yahweh of Gods swears by His Word.

[2] ZECHARIAH 11:8

והקצר נפשי בהם <sup>5</sup>	But I became impatient with them,
ורחיק מימרי יחזון <sup>6</sup>	And My Word has removed (loathed) them.

(9) GOD'S SPIRIT

<sup>1</sup>See page 37, footnote 2.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Knight (*op. cit.*, p. 42): "The word nephesh, however, is seldom specifically mentioned in the Old Testament in connection with God, but, when it is, it is probably a conscious anthropomorphism."

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint is literal; see page 37, footnote 2.

<sup>4</sup>"The Memra is prominent in connection with the divine oath." (Box, G. H., "The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology", *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 33(1932): 111. Cf. also, "It is the Memra who is always the subject of swearing or oath taking. Either the Memra takes the oath, or God swears by His Memra." (Abelson, J., *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature* [London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1912], p. 157).

<sup>5</sup>The Septuagint is literal; see page 37, footnote 2.

<sup>6</sup>A solecism (so Jansma, *op. cit.*, p. 101).

Three times the Targum substitutes Memra for spirit. In these passages<sup>1</sup> the targumist may have considered רוח ("spirit") to be the equivalent of the reflexive pronoun<sup>2</sup> or to be almost identical with God<sup>3</sup>.

[1] ZECHARIAH 4:6

כי אם-ברוחי	. . . but by my Spirit,	
אילחין גמימרי <sup>4</sup>	. . . except by My Word,	2/

[2] ZECHARIAH 7:12

אשר שלח יהוה צבאות ברוחו ביד הנביאים הראשונים	. . . which the Lord of hosts had sent by his Spirit through the former prophets.
דשלח יהוה צבאות במימריה ביד נביא <sup>5</sup> קדמאי	. . . which Yahweh of Hosts has sent by His Word through [by the hand of] the former prophets.

[3] MICAH 2:7

הקצר רוח יהוה	Is the Spirit of the Lord impatient?
היחקצר מימרי מן קדם יהוה	Has the Word from Yahweh been shortened?

<sup>1</sup>Zechariah 4:6; 7:12; Micah 2:7.

<sup>2</sup>" . . . he [Zechariah] elsewhere (4<sup>6</sup> 6<sup>8</sup>) seems to refer to the Spirit of Yahweh as if he were thinking of Yahweh himself," (Mitchell, Smith, Bower, op. cit., p. 202).

<sup>3</sup>" . . . ruah is the essential substance of the Divine Being," (Knight, op. cit., p. 47).

<sup>4</sup>The Septuagint renders literally.

<sup>5</sup>The Septuagint is literal.

Two other passages which refer to the Spirit of God are altered in the Targum. In these passages Memra is not used.

[4] ZECHARIAH 6:8

<sup>1</sup>היוצאים אל-ארץ צפון  
הניחו את-רוחי בארץ  
צפון

. . . those who go to-  
wards the north country  
have set my Spirit at  
rest in the north country.

<sup>2</sup>דנמקין בארע ציפונא  
אימר להון עיבידו ית  
רעותי בארע ציפונא

. . . those who are going  
to the land of the north,  
say to them, 'Do My Will  
in the land of the north'.

This translation softens the idea of "easing" or "setting God's Spirit at rest" by the command to do the will of God.

[5] HAGGAI 2:5

ורוחי עמדת בחוככם

My Spirit abides [stands]  
among you;

ונביי מלמין ביניכון

. . . and My prophets  
teach [among] you . . .

The remaining three references to God's Spirit in the Twelve are translated, substantially, literally. In Joel 2:28(3:1) f, the only change in the Hebrew is that the Targum adds the word קדש ("holy") to describe His Spirit. In Micah 3:8 נבואה ("prophecy") is added; thus the Targum says

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint here also avoids, see Appendix II.

<sup>2</sup>A free translation (so Rignell, *op. cit.*, p. 213).

that the prophet is filled with "Yahweh's Spirit of prophecy." The inconsistent rendering of the passages in the Twelve which refer to God's spirit makes it difficult to discover conclusively why the targumist altered certain passages and left others unaltered. One final passage is of interest because of the translation in the Targum.

[6] MICAH 3:7d

כי אין מענה אליהם

. . . for there is no answer from God.

ארי ליה בהון רוח  
יבואה מן קדם יהוה<sup>1</sup>

Because they do not have [lit., there is not in them] the Spirit of prophecy from Yahweh.

This translation avoids an anthropomorphism and also gives a fuller reason than why the seers are disgraced and the diviners are shamed. Moreover, it avoids the idea that God would not answer the people. It also places more responsibility upon the people and less upon God than the Hebrew does. It is illustrative of the increased importance of the Spirit of Yahweh.

(10) GOD COMPARED TO A FATHER AND MASTER

In Malachi 1:6, where God assumes that He is a father and a master, the Targum softens this anthropomorphism by

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum read its text as the Masoretic Text but "expanded the phrase slightly" (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 83).



the introduction of the comparative, <sup>1</sup> (as). Perhaps the use of these terms, אב <sup>2</sup> and אלהים <sup>3</sup>, as Divine names had lessened the anthropomorphic feeling towards them. The latter consistently is translated by אלהים whether אלהים refers to man or God.

In several passages actions are ascribed to Deity which imply that God is a father, e.g., the act of chastising (ענן). The Targum usually softens the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew slightly, yet retains the Hebrew meaning intact.

[1] HOSEA 7:12

אניסרם <sup>4</sup> I will chastise them . . .

אניסרם עליהם I will bring upon them  
chastisements . . .

[2] HOSEA 7:15

<sup>1</sup>Cf. I Samuel 15:29 Septuagint where the Greek translator tones down the Hebrew אלהים לא אדם ("for he is not a man, that he should repent,") by the insertion of ως (=א, as), i.e., οτι ουχ ως ανθρωπος εστιν του μετανοησαι [θ = παρακληθηναι; α = μεταμεληθηναι] αυτος ("For He is not as a man that He should repent" -- see Gehman, *op. cit.*, p. 293).

<sup>2</sup>For further information see: H. P. Smith, "Theophorous Proper Names in the Old Testament", *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, edited by R. F. Harper, F. Brown and G. F. Moore (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908), Vol. I, pp. 37-64; G. Buchanan Gray, *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896), pp. 22-75; and Martin Noth, *Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart: Verlag Von W. Kohlhammer, 1928).

<sup>3</sup>Rendered literally as אלהים in Hosea 12:15(14); Micah 4:13; Zechariah 4:14; 6:5 and Malachi 3:1.

<sup>4</sup>The Septuagint translates literally; see page 45, footnote 1.

ואני יסרתי <sup>1</sup>	. . . although I trained <sup>2</sup> . . .
וכמא דאנא מייתי ייסורין	. . . and as I bring chastisements. . .

## [3] HOSEA 5:2

ואני מוסר לכלם	. . . but I will chastise [am a corrector to] all of them.
ואנא מייתי ייסורין לכולהון	. . . and I will bring chastisement to all of them.

In both these instances the Targum softens the statement of God that He chastises to that of bringing chastisements. The meaning of יסר ("chastise") in Hosea 7:15 may be uncertain<sup>3</sup>, but the targumist certainly understood it in the sense of 'chastise'. In the remaining passage the targumist alters the meaning of the Hebrew and employs the intermediary device of the Memra.

## [4] HOSEA 10:10

---

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint translates literally; see page 45, footnote 2.

<sup>2</sup>"The usual meaning of יסר, chasten, punish . . ., i.e., strengthened by chastisement, gives no sense. If MT is retained it must mean trained, or disciplined," (Harper, op. cit., p. 306).

<sup>3</sup>See Harper, loc. cit. The Septuagint translates literally; see page 45, footnote 2.

בְּאוֹתִי וְאֶסְרֵם <sup>1</sup>	In my desire <sup>2</sup> . . . to chastise them;
בְּמִמְרִי אֵיִיתִי עֲלֵיהֶן יִסְרֵן	By My Word I will bring against them chastise-ments.

Probably בְּמִמְרִי ("by My Memra" = "Word") here translates the Hebrew בְּאוֹתִי ("in my desire", "when I desire"). If so, then the translation here follows the pattern already established.

# (11) GOD PORTRAYED AS KING

Usually the description of God as a king is left unchanged in the Targum<sup>3</sup>. In one passage, however, this concept is softened slightly:

## [1] ZECHARIAH 14:9

וְהָיָה יְהוָה לְמֶלֶךְ עַל- כָּל-הָאָרֶץ בְּיוֹם הַהוּא <sup>4</sup>	And the Lord will become king over all the earth;
וְהָיָה מְלִכּוּתָא דִּיהוָה עַל כָּל יְחָבִי אֶרֶא <sup>5</sup>	. . . and the kingdom of Yahweh will be revealed unto all the inhabitants of the earth;

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint varies slightly; see page 44; cf. page 258.

<sup>2</sup>Following The Revised Standard Version, footnote s, page 943.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., Zechariah 14:16f; Malachi 1:14.

<sup>4</sup>The Septuagint translates literally as *καὶ ἔσται κύριος εἰς βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν* ("And the Lord will be king over all the earth.").

<sup>5</sup>Jansma (*op. cit.*, p. 134) considers this to be a standard translation.

If the targumist interpreted  $\text{למלך}^1$  as a verbal form, then the translation here would be consistent with his translation of Micah 4:7 where it is stated that God reigns:

[2] MICAH 4:7

ומלך יהוה עליהם  
בהר ציון

. . . and the Lord will  
reign over them in Mount  
Zion. . .

ותיגלוי מלכותא  
דיהוה עליהון  
בטורא דציון

. . . and the kingdom of  
Yahweh will be revealed  
unto them in Mount Zion  
. . .

Since in both Zechariah 14:9 and Micah 4:7 a kingdom is described as being God's possession, the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew is retained. Therefore, the conclusion cannot be reached that the Targum avoided all anthropomorphic expressions<sup>2</sup>.

(12) GOD PICTURED AS A WITNESS

Three times in the Twelve God is described as being a witness or witnessing. The verb,  $\text{עוּר}$  ("to witness"), is translated accurately in Malachi 2:14 without the use of any protective device. The noun ( $\text{עֵד}$ ) is translated accurately enough, but in each passage the targumist substitutes Memra ( $\text{מימרא}$ ) for God as the witness, e.g.:

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., because he possessed a text without the initial  $\text{ל}$ .

<sup>2</sup>See Appendix VII.

MICAH 1:2<sup>1</sup>

וַיְהִי אֲדֹנָי יְהוֹה	... and let the Lord God
בְּכֶם לַעֲד	be a witness against you,
וַיְהִי מִימְרָא דִּיהוֹה	... and let the Word of
אֱלֹהִים בְּכוֹן לַפְּהִיד	Yahweh God be a witness
	against you,

## (13) THE CONCEPT OF GOD BEING WEARY

Only in one passage in the Twelve is God described as being made weary. In Malachi 2:17 this idea occurs twice:

הוֹנַעְתֶּם יְהוֹה בְּדַבְרֵיכֶם	You have wearied the Lord
וַאֲמַרְתֶּם בְּמֶה הוֹנַעְנוּ	with your words. Yet you
	say, "How have we wearied
	him?"
אֲחִלְתּוֹן קִדְם יְהוֹה	You cause to labor in
בְּפִיחֻגְמִיכוֹן וְאִם	Yahweh's Presence with your
חִימְרוֹן בְּמֶה אֲחִלְנָא	words, and yet you say,
קִדְמוֹהִי	"How have we caused to
	labor in His Presence?"

The targumist obviously had the same Hebrew text, but he desired to soften the anthropomorphism. Therefore, he added before God's name קִדְם ("before"). This fact is supported by the literal translation in the secular sense of יָנַע ("to make weary") in Habakkuk 2:13. Apparently the Septuagint<sup>2</sup> also avoided this concept in Malachi 2:17.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF GOD AS HAVING PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

God frequently is described as having hands, eyes,

<sup>1</sup>So also Malachi 3:5.

<sup>2</sup>See page 48.



feet, etc., which enable Him to see, feel, move about, eat, speak, etc. Many of these anthropomorphic terms are eliminated, softened, or otherwise avoided in the Targum.

(1) THE HAND AND ARM (SHOULDER) OF GOD

Frequently hand (יָד) is used in connection with Deity to express the idea of Divine punishment. In these instances the expression, מַחַת נְבוּרַחַי ("My Powerful Stroke"), usually is substituted for יָדִי ("My Hand").

[1] AMOS 1:8 L

<sup>1</sup>וְהִשִּׁיבֹתִי יָדִי עַל-  
עֲקֶרֶן

I will turn my hand  
against Ekron;

וְאֶחֱיֵב מַחַת נְבוּרַחַי  
עַל עֲקֶרֶן

And I will cause My  
Powerful Stroke (Blow) to  
turn against Ekron;

This same procedure is followed also in Zephaniah 1:4 L; 2:13 L; Zechariah 2:9(13) L<sup>2</sup>; 13:7 L. In each of these instances the Septuagint retains the anthropomorphism. In one passage (Hosea 2:12 [10]<sup>3</sup>) the expression יָדִי ("My Hand") is translated literally in the Targum (and also in the Septuagint). This literal rendering is especially surprising because portions of the same chapter have been interpreted allegorically.

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint renders fairly literally; καὶ ἐπαξω τὴν χεῖρα μου ἐπὶ Ἀκκαρων ("... and I will lay my hand on Akkaron,").

<sup>2</sup>See page 323.

<sup>3</sup>See page 214, footnote 1.

In several passages the expression, יד יהוה ("the hand of Yahweh"), does not convey this ominous thought, and, therefore, other devices were employed to avoid the anthropomorphism.

[2] AMOS 9:2 L

משם יד־י חקחם	From there shall my hand take them;
<sup>1</sup> מחמםן במִימְרִי יִדְבְּרוּן	From there by My Word they will bring them down.

[3] AMOS 7:7

וְבִידוֹ אֵנֶךְ	. . . with a plumb-line in his hand.
<sup>2</sup> וְקִדְמוֹהִי דִין	. . . and before him was judgment.

Apparently the targumist interpreted the plumb-line to mean judgment. Perhaps this interpretation accounts for the reason קִדְמוֹהִי, with the pronominal suffix, was used instead of מִימְרֵהוּ .

Two more passages occur with יד ("hand"). In Micah 5:8(9) יד ("hand") may be the "hand of God", or it may refer to the Israelitish remnant as Malbini<sup>3</sup> and others<sup>4</sup> have

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint is literal.

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint is literal.

<sup>3</sup>According to Cohen (op. cit., p. 177, footnotes).

<sup>4</sup>Rosenmiller, Ewald (op. cit., II, p. 318), Keil, C. F. (The Twelve Minor Prophets, tr. by Rev. James Martin [Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1868], I, p. 489), Kleinert, Roorda, Orelli, J.M.P. Smith, Marti, Nowack (so Smith, Ward, Beyer, op. cit., p. 112).

interpreted it. Perhaps the targumist considered it to refer to the remnant since he translated  $\text{ר}^1$  literally.

[4] HABAKKUK 3:4

קרנים מידו לו	. . . rays flashed from his hand;
וזיקוקין ממרכבת יקריה נמקין	. . . and sparks from the chariot of His Glory go forth;

The text here is very uncertain; this makes it difficult to reach any conclusions regarding this verse.

[5] HABAKKUK 2:16

תסוב עלך כוס ימין יהוה	The cup in the Lord's right hand -- will come around to you . . .
ימחר עלך כס דלוט מן קדם יהוה	. . . and the cup of cursing will return against you from Yahweh.

Apparently the Targum renders  $\text{ימין}$  ("right hand") as  $\text{ללוט}$  ("a curse, cursing").

At least one passage exists in which a Hebrew verb suggests that God possesses a hand and which the Targum

---

<sup>1</sup>Alternatively, this passage may have undergone revision, and the  $\text{מח נבורה}$  may have been replaced by the literal  $\text{ר}$ . This has been done in several places in the Targum of Onkelos where  $\text{מימרה}$  has been replaced by the literal  $\text{ר}$ . So Ringgren, H., Word and Wisdom: Studies In the Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East, (Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1947), p. 160.

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint is literal.

alters. In Jonah 1:4<sup>1</sup> the Targum softens מול ("hurl") to ארים ("raise").<sup>2</sup>

Usually the idea of smiting or piercing is reproduced literally in the Targum. In Habakkuk 3:14, however, the Targum alters the concept.

נקבה במטיו ראש  
פרזו יסערו  
להפיצני

Thou didst pierce with  
his<sup>3</sup> shafts the head of his  
warriors, who came like a  
whirlwind to scatter me,

בזעתא ימא בחוטריה  
דמשה וגיברי רישי  
משרית פרעה דחשיבו  
מחשבון בישן על  
עמך דברחון ברוח  
עלעולין

You divided the sea by the  
rod of Moses, and, the  
strong leaders of the army  
of Pharaoh who were devising  
evil devices against your  
people, you drove them by  
a whirlwind. aof

The Targum increases the anthropomorphism by translating יסערו ("they came like a whirlwind") as if it were דברחון ברוח ("you came like a whirlwind"), i.e., דברחון ברוח ("you drove them by a whirlwind"). Possibly the context recalled the Exodus to the attention of the translator who inserted it into his rendering. In any case the Targum here is obviously not anti-anthropomorphic.

The verb סער ("to storm, rage") also occurs in Zechariah 7:14<sup>4</sup> where ואסערום ("and I scattered them with a

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 69f.

<sup>2</sup>The versions are consistently softer than the Masoretic Text; the Syriac = ארים and the Vulgate, misit, so Kalisch, op. cit., p. 151.

<sup>3</sup>Following The Revised Standard Version footnote m, p. 977.

<sup>4</sup>The Septuagint may be a softening; see page 70.

whirlwind. . .") is rendered as וַאֲבִדְיָנוּ<sup>1</sup> ("and I will scatter them"). This may represent a softening of the Hebrew here. If this suggestion is correct, and if in Habakkuk 3:14 the targumist read a ה for a ' in יַסְעָרוּ, then the translation of Habakkuk 3:14 may be also a softening.

Moreover, God is described in Amos 9:5<sup>2</sup> as touching (נָגַע) <sup>3</sup> the land. The Targum softens this anthropomorphism into an anthropopathism by stating that God rebukes or is angry (נָגַע) <sup>4</sup> with the land.

# [6] HOSEA 11:3

סָקַחְם עַל-זְרוּעָתִי<sup>6</sup>

I took them up in his<sup>7</sup>  
arms. . .

*R.S.V. translation  
has amended  
initial verb.*

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Hosea 13:3 where the Targum retains the idea of blowing and also Jonah 1:11,13 where it reproduces adequately the idea of the Hebrew.

<sup>2</sup> וַאֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה הַצְבָּאוֹת הַנוֹגֵעַ בָּאָרֶץ ("The Lord, God of Hosts, he who touches the earth. . .").

<sup>3</sup>Usually נָגַע ("touch, draws near") is translated by קָרַב ("to draw near"). In Hosea 4:2, however, the clause containing it is changed completely. In Zechariah 2:12(8) נָגַע occurs twice; the first one is rendered as here by קָרַב, but the second by נָגַע. The translations of the passages in which נָגַע is used non-theologically suggest strongly the possibility that the translation of Amos 9:5 is a softening.

<sup>4</sup> וַיְהוָה אֱלֹהִים צְבָאוֹת דָּנוּיָא בָּאָרֶץ (" . . . and Yahweh, the God of Hosts, is the One Who is angry with the earth").

<sup>5</sup>See a discussion of this passage on pages 158f.

<sup>6</sup>The Septuagint, Syriac, and Vulgate read "my shoulders".

<sup>7</sup>Following The Revised Standard Version, footnote a, page 944.



וְנִסְלַחְתִּינוּ כִּיד עַל  
דְּרַעֵי

. . . and I carried  
(received) them as upon  
the arms (shoulders) .  
. . .

In this one instance of shoulders (arms) in the Twelve, the Targum seems to be more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew. Could the targumist have considered the reference to be to the arms of the messenger of God?

In conclusion, the targumist apparently follows a plan to avoid certain anthropomorphic concepts of Deity which imply that God has hands of His own. Whenever (with the one exception of the literal rendering in Hosea 2:12 [10]) the hand of God is used to express Divine Judgment, the phrase *סִמָּה גְּבוּרָתִי* (with the appropriate pronominal suffix) occurs. When it does not have this ominous connotation, other devices, e.g., *מִימְרָא*, are used. Certain verbs which imply hands, e.g., to touch, are avoided, but generally the verbs are reproduced faithfully.

## (2) THE EYES OF GOD

"Eye" (*עֵינַי*) is another anthropomorphic term which the Targum avoids. Whenever the term "eye" (*עֵינַי*) represents the equivalent of the personal pronoun, the substitution of *Memra* (*מִימְרָא*) is made.

[1] AMOS 9:3 L<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Also in Amos 9:4 L (without *קִרְבִּי*); Jonah 2:5 L; Habakkuk 1:13 L (without *קִרְבִּי*).

ואם יסתרו מנוד עיני  
בקרע הים

. . . and though they  
hide from my sight at the  
bottom of the sea,

ואם יסתרון בני ימא  
מן קדם מימרי

. . . and though they hide  
in the islands of the sea  
from My Word. . .

In two passages<sup>1</sup> קדם ("before") is used without Memra (מימרא) to avoid the ascription of eyes to Deity. In both these passages the expression, "in My (Yahweh's) eyes" is the equivalent of "in the presence of Yahweh". Therefore, the rendering in the Targum as קדמי ("before Me") is appropriate. Perhaps these translations explain the rendering of the Targum in Zechariah 9:1.

3 כי ליהוה עין אדם

For to the Lord belong(s)  
the eye of Adam (or man),<sup>2</sup>

ארי קדם יהוה גלן עובדי  
בני איושא

Because before Yahweh are <sup>revealed</sup>  
the deeds of the sons of  
man,

A similar translation also occurs in Amos 9:8 L:

הנה עיני אדני יהוה

Behold, the eyes of the  
Lord God . . .

הא קדם יהוה אלהים  
גלן עובדי

Behold, before Yahweh,  
God, is revealed the  
deeds of . . .

These two translations avoid the grossly anthropomorphic expression, the "eyes of Yahweh", yet not in the same way. In Zechariah 9:1 the targumist apparently substitutes

<sup>1</sup>Malachi 2:17; Zechariah 8:6; cf. the Septuagint; see page 54, footnote 4.

<sup>2</sup>Following The Revised Standard Version, footnote k, page 989.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the Septuagint ; see pages 55f.

עֵינַי ("the deeds of the sons of") for עֵינַי ("eye"), and קדם ("before") here apparently translates the ל in לִיהוָה ("to Yahweh"). On the other hand in Amos 9:8 L, as in the above mentioned Malachi 2:17 and Zechariah 8:6, the קדם ("before") seemingly translates עֵינַי ("the eyes of Yahweh"), and the נִלְן עֹבְדֵי ("is revealed the deeds of") apparently is added. Similarly, in Zechariah 4:10<sup>1</sup> the Targum avoids the implication of eyes belonging to God by the substitution of עֵינַי for קדם :

שבעה-אלה עיני יהוה  
המה משוטטות בכל-  
הארץ

These seven are the eyes  
of the Lord, which range  
through the whole earth.

שבעה נידובין כאילין  
קדם יהוה נלן עובדי בני אינשא  
בכל ארעא

...seven rows (of stones) as  
these. Before Yahweh are  
revealed the deeds of men  
in all the earth.<sup>2</sup>

The two passages which state or imply that God is looking upon Israel (or Judah) the targumist interprets as being favorable to Israel (or Judah), using the verb נִלְן ("to reveal") and the expression, נְבוֹרָתִי ("My Power"):

## [2] ZECHARIAH 9:8

כי עתה ראיח בעיני

... for now I see with  
my own eyes.

ארי כען נליח נבורתי  
לאיטבא להון<sup>3</sup>

... for now I revealed  
My Power to do good to  
them.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 56f.

<sup>2</sup>Following Wright (*op. cit.*, p. 55) essentially.

<sup>3</sup>A solecism (so Jansma, *op. cit.*, p. 113).

ג  
appears  
Zech 9'  
also.

## [3] ZECHARIAH 12:4 L

ועל-בית יהודה אפתח  
אח-עיני

But upon the house of  
Judah I will open my  
eyes,

<sup>1</sup> ועל דבית יהודה  
אינלי יה נבורתי  
לאימבא לחון

And unto the house of  
Israel I will reveal My  
Power to do good to them.

These two translations may be due as much to a pro-Israel bias as to an anti-anthropomorphic bias. In Zechariah 12:4 the verb of motion may have suggested the use of the verb, נל ("to reveal").

The only remaining passage which involves the "eyes of God" is:

## [4] HOSEA 13:14

נחם יסתר מעיני

Compassion [repentance]  
is hid from my eyes.

ועל דעברו על אוריתי  
איסליק שכינתי מניהון

. . . and because they  
transgress My law, I  
will cause My Shekinah to  
ascend from them.

Although the motive for the avoidance of מעיני is obvious, the reason for the selection of שכינתי, etc., is not clear<sup>2</sup>.

The concept of God seeing occurs fairly frequently,

<sup>1</sup>"Probably T. parallelizes with ix 8." (Jansma, op. cit., p. 113).

<sup>2</sup>See pages 296, 313, 316, 326 and 339ff.

but there is no consistent method of translating the different expressions. The verb, רָאָה ("to see"), is translated literally in Hosea 6:10 but is eliminated in Habakkuk 3:6. Moreover, the anti-anthropomorphic intermediary, Memra, is employed in Habakkuk 1:13<sup>1</sup>. In Hosea 9:10 the verb is translated by חָבַב ("to love")<sup>2</sup>. In Jonah 3:10 L and Zechariah 9:8<sup>3</sup>, on the other hand, the idea is retained, yet it is softened by the use of the impersonal passive of נָלַי:

וַיִּרְאֵה אֱלֹהִים אֶת-  
מַעֲשֵׂיהֶם

When God saw what they  
did,

וְנִלְן קִדְם יְהוָה יֵח  
עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ

. . . and their deeds  
were revealed before  
Yahweh.

The situation concerning נָבַט ("to observe") is somewhat different. Twice it occurs in Habakkuk 1:13. The first time the targumist renders נָבַט literally<sup>4</sup>, yet in the Targum this is really a continuation of the preceding clause which has for its subject Memra (מִימְרָא) not God. Since Memra sees instead of God, there is no need to change the translation. The targumist also avoids the anthropomorphism of the second occurrence of נָבַט in Habakkuk 1:13 by the change of subject:

לִמָּה תִבְטִיט בְּנֹדִים

. . . why dost thou look  
upon faithless men,

<sup>1</sup>See page 217, footnote 1. Memra is probably due to the presence of "eye" (עַיִן).

<sup>2</sup>The Masoretic Text, fathers," is translated as your fathers,").

רָאִיתִי אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם ("I saw your  
חָבַבְתִּי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם ("I loved

<sup>3</sup>See pages 219f.

<sup>4</sup>See page 217, footnote 1.



ולמה אנה מסתכל  
באנשים

. . . and why do I look  
upon oppressors?

In only one other passage in the Twelve is God said  
to look up (observe - נבט):

[5] AMOS 5:22

ושלם מריאיכם לא  
אביס

. . . and the peace  
offerings of your fatted  
beasts I will not look  
upon.

וניכסת קודשיכון לא  
יחבלון קדמי

. . . and your holy victims  
will not be received be-  
fore Me.

Although this translation avoids the possible anthro-  
pomorphism of the Hebrew, much of the idea of the Hebrew is  
retained.

The other verbs which suggest that God can see, and,  
therefore, possesses eyes, are **פנה** ("to look") and **שור** ("to  
observe"). The former occurs only twice. In Malachi 2:13<sup>1</sup>  
it is reproduced faithfully, but in Zephaniah 3:15<sup>2</sup> the verb  
**פלי** ("to split, search") is substituted for **פנה** ("to look").  
The other verb, **שור** ("to observe"), also occurs in the  
Twelve only twice:

[6] HOSEA 13:7

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 57f., 58 footnote 1.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 57, footnote 4.

בומר על-דרך אשור

. . . like a leopard I  
will lurk [watch] beside  
the way.

כנימרא דכמין על  
שבילא

. . . as a leopard who lies  
in wait upon the path.

The Memra (מימרא), introduced earlier in the verse,  
here is compared by the targumist to a leopard.

[7] HOSEA 14:9(8)

ואשורנו

. . . and [I] look on  
him;<sup>1</sup>

ואירחם עלוהי  
(במימרי)

. . . and I will have  
compassion on him (by My  
Word). . .

This last translation may also reflect a pro-Israel  
bias.

— — — — —

The gross anthropomorphic picture of God's eye is  
avoided in the Targum. Memra is used when עין ("eye") is  
almost identical with the personal pronoun. The prepositional  
phrase (בעיני) appropriately is rendered by קדמי. Certain  
expressions concerning God's eyes could not be avoided  
satisfactorily by the use of Memra. Hence the passive and/or  
קדם ("before") were employed to convey the same general idea  
but without the gross anthropomorphic phrase. Twice the  
expression, "the eyes of God", is given a favorable inter-  
pretation in the Targum. In these passages, גבורתי is  
employed with an appropriate verb.

<sup>1</sup>American Jewish Translation.

In one passage both the Hebrew meaning and the translation are uncertain -- yet the translation avoids the anthropomorphic picture.

Concerning verbs which suggest that God has eyes, the situation is not so evident. Whenever the targumist uses Memra or another anti-anthropomorphic device in connection with the verbs, the verbs usually are reproduced in the Targum literally. At times קדם, with or without the passive of נל, avoids the anthropomorphism, and twice the anthropopathic verbs, חבב ("love") and רחם ("to be compassionate"), soften the Hebrew. Therefore, the conclusion must be reached that the targumist avoids describing Deity as possessing a human eye.

### (3) THE FEET OF GOD

In the Twelve, three times God is described as having feet. In two passages (Nahum 1:3<sup>1</sup>; Zechariah 14:4) the Targum omits the mention of God's feet. The remaining instance occurs in the difficult third chapter of Habakkuk where Memra apparently is substituted for "feet".

#### [1] HABBAKUK 3:5 L

ויצא רשף לרגליו

And fiery bolts go forth  
at His feet.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Unless in Nahum 1:3 קדמוהי ("before Him") stands for His Feet.

<sup>2</sup>American Jewish Translation.

ונפיק כשלחוביה  
אישתא מן מימריה

... and go out as  
flames of fire from His  
Word.

[2] NAHUM 1:3

ועון אבק רגליו

... and the clouds are  
the dust of his feet.

ועון אמיסתא כיבש  
קדמוהי

... and he lays down a  
cloud of dust before Him.

[3] ZECHARIAH 14:4

ועמדו רגליו ביום-  
ההוא

On that day his feet shall  
stand . . .

ויחגלי<sup>1</sup> בגבורתיה  
בעידנה

... and He will be  
revealed with His Power  
at that time . . .

Certain verbs also suggest the existence of feet. The verb עמד ("to stand"), will be discussed later in connection with the denial of place to Deity. In four passages the verb ירך ("to tread") occurs. In one passage (Micah 1:3) the verb is reproduced literally, but in the other three instances, the Targum differs from the Hebrew.

[4] AMOS 4:13

ודרך על-במתי ארץ

... and treads on the  
heights of the earth . . .

דאזיל וחקין ולאייתאח  
חשון לרשיעא למיחבר  
רשיעי ארעא

... who goes and prepares  
and brings darkness to the  
wicked in order that he may  
bruise the wicked of the  
earth.

---

<sup>1</sup>Perhaps בגבורתיה represents רגליו?

## [5] HABAKKUK 3:15

דרכה בים סוסין

Thou didst trample the  
sea with thy horses,1אֵיחֻלִּיתָהּ עַל יָמָא  
בְּמִרְכַּבָּהּ יָקָרָהYou were revealed over  
the sea in the chariot of  
your glory.

## [6] ZECHARIAH 9:13

כִּי־דִרְכָּתִי לִי יְהוּדָה

For I have bent [i.e.,  
with the foot] Judah as  
my (bow);אֲרִי אֲחֻקִּיפֶיהָ קִדְמִי  
דְּבִיָּהּ יְהוּדָהBecause I have made the  
house of Judah strong  
before Me;

Therefore, a consideration of these passages (which contain the anthropomorphic pictures of God's feet) reveals that the Targum consistently alters this anthropomorphism -- although not always in the same way. Certain alterations suggest that the Targumist possibly was influenced by his treatment of motion and place with reference to Deity and by a pro-Israel bias.

## (4) THE MOUTH OF GOD

God is described only twice as having a mouth in the Twelve. In both places Memra occurs in the Targum, yet only in Micah 4:4 is Memra indisputably a substitute for פֶּה ("mouth").

<sup>1</sup>The Septuagint also changes; see page 71.



## [1] HOSEA 6:5

הֲרַגְתִּים בְּאִמְרֵי-פִי	I have slain them by the words of my mouth,
אֵי־חַיִּי עָלֵיהֶן קָטַלְתִּי עַל דַּעְבְּרוֹ עַל מִימַר רְעוּתִי	I brought against them murderers because they have transgressed against the Word of My Will . . .

## [2] MICAH 4:4

כִּי-פִי יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת דָּבַר	. . . for the mouth of the Lord of Hosts has spoken.
<sup>1</sup> אֲרִי בְּמִימְרָא דִּיהוָה צְבָאוֹת גִּזֵּר כִּי	Because by the Word of Yahweh of hosts this is decreed.

Although the mouth of God occurs seldom in the Twelve, there are many actions of God which imply that He possessed a mouth. Thus, in Hosea 13:8<sup>2</sup>, God is described as eating, but the Targum alters this to the idea of killing (קטל).

## [3] ZECHARIAH 9:14

וְאֲדֹנֵי יְהוָה בְּשׁוֹפָר יִחְקֹעַ	. . . the Lord God will sound the trumpet,
וּמִן קֶדֶם יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים בְּשׁוֹפְרָא יִחְקֹעַ	. . . the trumpet will sound before Yahweh God, <sup>3</sup>

## [4] HAGGAI 1:9

---

<sup>1</sup>This translation "is no doubt an attempt to avoid a seeming anthropomorphism." (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 96).

<sup>2</sup>See pages 240f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. I Corinthians 15:52.

ונפחתי בו	I blew it away.
ואנא שלח ביה	. . . and I send upon it.

This translation of נפח ("blow") as שלח ("send") softens the Hebrew somewhat.

God is also described as possessing a voice. Usually, in the Targum, Memra is substituted for voice, for example:

[5] JOEL 2:11 L<sup>1</sup>

ויהוה נחן קולו	The Lord utters his voice . . .
ויהוה ארים מימריה	. . . and Yahweh lifts up His Word . . .

[6] HAGGAI 1:12 L<sup>2</sup>

וישמע זרובבל...בקול יהוה אלהיהם	Then Zerubbabel . . . obeyed the voice of the Lord their God,
ושמע זרובבל...למימרא דיהוה אלההון	Then Zerubbabel . . . obeyed the Word of Yahweh their God. . .

In one passage (Micah 6:9), however, the substitution of Memra (מימרא) for voice (קול) is not made. In this place the addition of "the prophets" (נביא) is made to avoid the anthropomorphism. This is an addition which one would

---

<sup>1</sup>This same substitution occurs also in Joel 4(3):16 L and Amos 1:2 L.

<sup>2</sup>This same substitution occurs also in Zechariah 6:15 L. In this verse a different verb translates שמע .

have thought to have been made more frequently.

[7] MICAH 6:9

קול יהוה לעיר יקרא	The voice of the Lord cries to the city . . .
<sup>1</sup> קול נבייא דיהוה על קרתא מכלן	The voice of the prophets of Yahweh, they call to the city.

In Zephaniah 3:2, the targumist apparently understood the voice in קול ("She listens to no voice,") to refer to the voice of Deity because he translates the clause as, לא שמעה בקל עבדוהי נבייא ("She did not listen to the voice of His servants, the prophets").

Perhaps the normal substitution of Memra (מִמְרָא Word) for voice (קול) may explain why Memra is not used, usually, in the translation of דבר<sup>2</sup> ("to speak"). In three passages<sup>3</sup>, however, Memra does occur.

[8] OBADIAH 18<sup>4</sup>

כי יהוה דבר	. . . for the Lord has spoken.
ארי במימרא דיהוה נזיר כין	. . . for by the Word of Yahweh this is decreed. . .

<sup>1</sup>The Targum avoids anthropomorphic expressions: (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 140).

<sup>2</sup>In Joel 2:11 the noun דבר is rendered by מִמְרָא; cf. Hosea 13:14, where דבר (= "plague") also is translated by מִמְרָא.

<sup>3</sup>The same clause and translation occur in Joel 4(3):8.

<sup>4</sup>In one passage (Micah 4:4) פה ("mouth") occurs; see page 227.

In Hosea 1:2 the targumist apparently took the verb דבר ("speak") as a noun since he translated it by פִּתְחוּמָא ("a decree, word") -- his usual translation of the noun. In Amos 3:1 the verb נִזַּר ("decree") is used to translate דָּבַר :

[9] AMOS 3:1

אֲשֶׁר דָּבַר יְהוָה

. . . that the Lord has  
spoken . . .

דִּנְזַר יְהוָה

. . . that the Lord has  
decreed. . .

This translation of דָּבַר ("speak") by נִזַּר ("decree") is a natural one. In Hosea 12:11 and Amos 3:8 the concept of God speaking is retained, although a different verb, סָלַל ("to say, speak"), is used. In Habakkuk 2:1 the same verb occurs, but it is altered to an impersonal passive form.

[10] HABAKKUK 3:2

יְהוָה שָׁמַעְתִּי שִׁמְעָךְ

O Lord, I have heard  
report of thee,

יְהוָה שָׁמַעְתִּי שִׁמְעֵיךְ גְּבוּרָתְךָ

O Yahweh, I have heard  
the report of Your Power,

Here the idea hearing God's report has been softened by the addition of גְּבוּרָתְךָ ("your power").

The statement that God is silent occurs twice in the Twelve and is altered both times.

[11] HABAKKUK 1:13<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 67.

חַרִישׁ בְּבֹלַע רָשָׁע  
צָדִיק מִמּוֹ

. . . and art [thou]  
silent when the wicked  
swallows up the man more  
righteous than he?

וְאַתָּה יְהִיב אֲרָכָה  
לְרַשָּׁעִים וּמַסְלֵעִים  
לְדַמְבִּין מִיִּנְהוּן

. . . and you give length  
of life to the wicked and  
they consume the ones more  
righteous than themselves?

[12] ZEPHANIAH 3:17<sup>1</sup>

יְחַרִישׁ בְּאַהֲבָתוֹ

. . . he will be silent<sup>2</sup>  
in his love;

יִכְבוֹשׁ עַל חֹבוֹךְ  
בְּרַחֲמָתָהּ

. . . he will tread upon  
your sins by his love;

Note that the Targum here is really more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew in its translation of יְחַרִישׁ ("he will be silent") as יִכְבוֹשׁ ("he will tread").

With three exceptions, all of which translate "answered and said," the statement that Yahweh answered (עָנָה<sup>3</sup>) consistently is softened by the rendering קָבַל, which normally means "to receive"<sup>4</sup>. In the three exceptions mentioned, this verb would be unintelligible, and, consequently, the verb, חָוַב, "to turn", is employed: once<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 66f.

<sup>2</sup>Following The Revised Standard Version footnote 1, p. 982.

<sup>3</sup>For Micah 3:7, see page 206.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 2:23(21); 14:9(8); Jonah 2:3; Micah 3:4; Zechariah 10:6; 13:9. In the first passage עָנָה ("to answer") occurs twice; the first עָנָה is translated by קָבַל ("to receive") and the second by פָּקַד ("to command").

<sup>5</sup>Habakkuk 2:2 (includes קָדַם).



its passive form ("to be answered") occurs, and twice<sup>1</sup> the active form is used.

The idea of God calling (קרא) is not consistently rendered in the Targum. In Hosea 11:1 and Haggai 1:11 the verb is rendered literally as קרי ("to call"). The anthropomorphism, however, in Joel 3:5 (2:32) is softened by translating the verb as "to appoint" (זמין). In Amos 5:8 (and 9:6) where God calls the waters, the Targum, although retaining the idea of calling or speaking, safeguards Deity somewhat by the translation, דאמר לכונשא משיריין דסניאין

כמי<sup>2</sup> ("Who commands to gather armies which are numerous as the waters of the sea"). Moreover, in Amos 7:4 where God calls to contend by fire, the Targum faithfully reproduces the idea but transforms קרא ("to call") into a verb of motion, עתיד<sup>ready, about to</sup> ("to come"). In Zechariah 7:7 the prophet says that God is calling or proclaiming. In the Targum this idea is softened slightly by rendering קרא ("to call") as שלח ("to send").

The use of the prophets as intermediary agents, as in Zechariah 7:7, both in the Hebrew and in the Targum, is developed more fully in the Targum of Micah 6:9<sup>3</sup> and of Zechariah 7:13. The Targum of the latter reads כמא דאיתחובא

<sup>1</sup>Joel 2:19; Zechariah 1:13.

<sup>2</sup>The Targum of Amos 9:6 reads נהרא for כמי.

<sup>3</sup>See page 229.

להון נבייא ("as the prophets prophesied to them") for  
 כאשר-קרא ("as He called,"<sup>1</sup>).

This same inconsistency of translation applies also to נוד (hiphil = "to declare, tell") which is rendered literally in Amos 4:13 by חוי ("to tell"). In Zechariah 9:12, however, the idea has been softened slightly by the insertion of אשלח to make the idea, "I send to tell you" instead of "telling you."<sup>2</sup>

While the pictures of the mouth (and voice) of God are consistently avoided in the Targum, usually by the employment of Memra, the verbs which imply that God has a physical mouth are not circumvented so consistently. Certain grosser anthropomorphisms, e.g., Yahweh's blowing of a trumpet, have been avoided. Other concepts have been softened. These alterations show that the targumist was offended at the suggestion that God had a physical mouth of His own and attempted, therefore to avoid or soften this portrayal of Deity.

## (5) THE FACE OF GOD

The face of God is a frequently occurring expression

### <sup>1</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>2</sup>The Masoretic Text is: היום אני אודיע ("today I declare. . ."). See page 63 for the Septuagint and other information. The Targum renders as: היום אשלח ("also this day I send to tell").

in the Twelve and, with three exceptions, consistently is translated by קדם <sup>1</sup>, an accurate enough translation for פנים with its prepositional prefixes. Twice <sup>2</sup> קדם occurs, but בלשם דיהוה <sup>3</sup> דאיתנבי ("to avoid prophesying in the name of Yahweh") is also added. In one passage, however, the intermediary device of the Shekinah is employed:

MICAH 3:4 L

ויסתר פניו מהם בעת  
ההיא

\* \* \* he will hide his  
face from them at that  
time,

ויסלק שבותיה מניהון  
בעידנא <sup>4</sup>

\* \* \* and His Shekinah  
will ascend from them at  
that time,

Certainly both the Hebrew and the Aramaic express the same idea, namely, a graphic expression of displeasure. In this last instance, however, the usual stereotyped translation would not convey the Hebrew meaning, and so naturally the alternate idea of using the Shekinah suggests itself.

(6) THE NOSE OF GOD

Finally, although the concept of a nose is nowhere

---

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 5:15; 6:2; 7:2; Jonah 1:2,10; Nahum 1:5; Habakkuk 2:20; 3:5; Zephaniah 1:7; Haggai 1:12; 2:14; Zechariah 2:17(18) [see page 52]; 7:2; 8:21,22; Malachi 1:9; 3:1,14,16.

<sup>2</sup>Jonah 1:3 (twice).

<sup>3</sup>This translation conveys the import of the Masoretic Text.

<sup>4</sup>"The Targum modifies the anthropomorphic," expression (Taylor, op. cit., p. 79).

encountered in the Targum, nevertheless, there are three<sup>1</sup> rather interesting interpretations of the phrase, ארך-אף, "length of nose". Rather than the usual interpretation of 'long-suffering', the targumist has translated both words as מרחיק רגז (הוא) ("removing anger"). This translation does convey, ultimately, the same meaning as the Hebrew -- yet the Hebrew is somewhat more picturesque. The use of אף otherwise is interpreted metaphorically, even as the verb, "to smell" (ריח), is in Amos 5:21<sup>2</sup>.

#### (7) THE HEART OF GOD

The concept of God with a human heart is found only in one place in the Twelve, namely, Hosea 11:8. Here the Hebrew נהפך עלי לבי ("My heart recoils within me,") is avoided by the translation כימר קיימי קבילי ("there comes up the Word of My covenant to obey (receive) Me").

#### (8) THE MIND OF GOD

The statement that God has an intellect is not stated directly in the Masoretic Text of the Twelve, but this conception of Deity is implied in several passages in the Twelve. For instance, in six passages God is said to remember:

---

<sup>1</sup>Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; Nahum 1:3

<sup>2</sup>Cripps ( *op. cit.*, pp. 26,195) considers that the Masoretic Text here means that God refused to smell Israel's offerings. If this view is correct the Targum here is anti-anthropomorphic.

[1] HOSEA 5:3<sup>1</sup>

אני ידעתי אפרים	I know Ephraim . . .
קדמי גלן עובדי ביה אפרים	Before Me are revealed the works of the house of Ephraim. ..

This translation of "אני ידעתי" ("I know") as קדמי<sup>2</sup>  
גלן ("Before Me are revealed") avoids the concept that God  
knows, i.e., the conception that God has an intellect or mind.

[2] HOSEA 13:5<sup>3</sup>

אני ידעתיך במדבר <sup>4</sup>	It was I who knew you in the wilderness,
אנא סופיקיה צורכיכון במדברא	I gave you your necessities in the wilderness,

The Targum has interpreted God's statement that He  
knew Israel in the wilderness to mean that God supplied there  
their needs -- food, water, etc. Even so, the translation  
avoids the conception of the mind (intellect) of Deity.

## [3] AMOS 3:2

---

<sup>1</sup>For Hosea 8:4 see page 324; there the passage  
implies that God is not omniscient.

<sup>2</sup>The same procedure occurs also in the Targum of Amos  
5:12 and Nahum 1:7 (for the latter see pages 281f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 132f and 151.

<sup>4</sup>"... a common expression = to show favor," (Harper,  
op. cit., p. 397).



רק אחכם ידעתי מכל  
משפחות

You only have I known  
of all the families of  
the earth;

לחוד בכוון איתקעתי  
מכל זרעייה ארעא

Only you have I chosen  
from all the kindreds of  
the earth;

The Targum here translates the meaning of the Hebrew<sup>1</sup> and yet avoids the conception of Deity as having a mind. Statements that God remembers<sup>2</sup>, forgets<sup>3</sup>, and thinks<sup>4</sup> usually undergo changes in the Targum's translation. Moreover, usually, the concept of Deity as thinking or counseling<sup>5</sup> is avoided in the Targum. In Micah 4:12 "the thoughts ( מחשבות ) of Deity" is rendered as His secrets ( רזיא )<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Harper, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 68. Cripps (*op. cit.*, p. 151) disagrees with Harper, yet Gressman (*loc. cit.*) and the Targum apparently agree with Harper's suggestion.

<sup>2</sup>See pages 325f.

<sup>3</sup>See pages 324f.

<sup>4</sup>See page 325. Micah 2:3 is rendered fairly literally.

<sup>5</sup>In Micah 4:12 counsel ( עצו ) is rendered adequately as במילכוהי.

<sup>6</sup>"Targ. has רזיא, a rendering the genesis of which is well brought out in Dr. Hatch's note on *μυστηριον* : -- 'It is frequently used in the Apocryphal books . . . in a majority of passages of secrets of state, or the plans which a king kept in his own mind. This was a strictly Oriental conception. A king's 'counsel' was his 'secret,' which was known only to himself and his trusted friends. It was natural to extend the conception to the secret plans of God.' It is not without interest to note this similarity in mode of thought between the Targumist and the Jews who wrote Greek." (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 106).

In Amos 4:13, however, God's thoughts (שחן)<sup>1</sup> are conceived as being His Works (עובדות).

—                      —                      —                      —                      —

The above passages demonstrate clearly that the targumist usually sought to avoid the implication that God possessed a mind or intellect, presumably with physical or human limitations.

#### (9) THE EARS OF GOD

The concept of God possessing ears is implied whenever God is said to hear (שמע). The Targum usually avoids this idea, but in Amos 5:23 the verb is rendered literally. Examples of instances where the Targum alters the verb are:

##### [1] JONAH 2:3(2)

שמעה קולי	... and thou didst hear my voice.
עבדת בעותי	... you have done My will.

In Micah 7:7 and Zechariah 7:13 God is said to receive (קבל) people's prayers (עליוהוון) instead of hearing (שמע) people. In Zephaniah 2:8 the impersonal passive of שמע occurs, with קדמי ("before Me"), to avoid the concept of God hearing. The translation, however, of Habakkuk 1:2 is

---

<sup>1</sup>Occurs only here (Cripps, *op. cit.*, p. 177); cf. the Septuagint (see page 135). Harper (*op. cit.*, p. 103) considers that the Targum is the equivalent of the Hebrew מעשהו. The Syriac renders as "how great is his glory" (*Ibid.*, p. 104).

interesting:

[2] HABAKKUK 1:2

ולא תשמע	... and thou wilt not hear?
הלא גלי קדמך	It is not revealed before you?

This passive expression also occurs in Malachi 3:16:

[3] MALACHI 3:16

ויקשב יהוה וישמע	... the Lord heeded and heard them,
ושמיע קדם יהוה וגלי קדמוהי	... there is heard before Yahweh and revealed before Him,

The last passage (Malachi 3:16) also contains a synonym for שמע . This verb (קשב) also is softened in the Targum.

Therefore the targumist usually avoids stating that God hears anyone or anything.

### 3. ANTI-ANIMISTIC<sup>1</sup> TENDENCIES OF THE TARGUM

Usually the targumist introduces some type of alteration to avoid describing God as an animal or an inanimate object<sup>2</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>This word includes all animate and inanimate things except man.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Habakkuk 1:12 where the term צור ("Rock") as a name for God is omitted in the Targum; cf. the Septuagint (see pages 74f).

etc.

In the majority of the examples, Memra (מימרא) is substituted for God and the comparison is retained, e.g.:

(1) HOSEA 5:12 E<sup>1</sup>

ואני כעש לאפרים

Therefore I am like a moth to Ephraim,

ומימרי כעשא לדבית  
אפרים

Therefore My Word (Memra) is like a moth to the house of Ephraim,

When God is described as being a light, the Targum softens the animism by translating the noun into a verb:

(2) MICAH 7:8

יהוה אור לי

... the Lord will be a light to me.

יהוה ינהר עלי

Yahweh is shining unto me.

Another change of considerable interest concerns the only comparison, in the Twelve, of Deity to a lion(ess) in which Memra is not the device used to safeguard the concept of Deity.

(3) HOSEA 13:8

---

<sup>1</sup>See also Hosea 5:14 E ("lion" = שחל); 14:6 E ("dew" = טל); 13:8 E ("bear" = יד); see pages 240f); 5:14 ("lion" = כביר); cf. also Hosea 5:12b ("rotteness" = רקב); 13:7b (see pages 222f); and Zechariah 2:9[5] ("wall" = חומה). For the Septuagint see pages 73ff.

ואכלם שם כלביא

. . . and there I will  
devour them like a  
lion[ess],

וקטילחיון חמן כבני  
אריון

. . . and I will kill  
them there as the off-  
spring of lions,

This translation may soften the picture a little, but it remains as animistic as the Hebrew. Two other alterations are:

(4) HOSEA 14:9(8)

אני כפרוש רענן

I am like an evergreen  
cypress,

אעבדיניה כבירון שפירן

I will make him [the  
Israelites] as a  
beautiful fir,

(5) AMOS 5:6

פן-יצלח כאש בית יוסף

. . . lest he break out  
like fire in the house  
of Joseph,

דילמא ידלק כאשתא  
רוגזיה בבית יוסף

. . . lest perchance His  
rage is kindled as fire  
against the House of  
Joseph,

Finally, the conception of Deity as an animal may be implied in the description of God as roaring<sup>1</sup>, yet the Targum apparently avoids this description only once:

(6) HOSEA 11:10<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See the conception of God as talking on pages 229ff.

<sup>2</sup>In Amos 1:2 and Joel 4(3):13 the translation is literal.



כאריה ישאנ  
כי-הוא ישאנ

... he will roar like  
a lion; yea, he will  
roar,

מימריה כאריא דמכלי  
ארי הוא יכלי

His word is as a lion  
which roars, for He will  
roar,

X

X

X

X

X

Since the targumist almost always avoids the grosser anthropomorphisms, the conclusion thus far is inescapable that the Targum exhibits an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE TARGUM:

#### THE LESSER ANTHROPOMORPHISMS

The Targum does not avoid the lesser anthropomorphisms to the same extent that it does the greater ones, but here, too, the Targum, quite obviously, shows a much greater anti-anthropomorphic tendency than the Septuagint.

#### 1. THE ANTI-ANTHROPOPATHIC EXPRESSIONS OF THE TARGUM

Generally speaking, the anti-anthropopathic tendency exhibited by the targumist is not as great as his anti-anthropomorphic tendency. There are, however, certain emotional descriptions which are altered consistently in the Twelve, and these alterations may be due either to this anti-anthropopathic tendency or else to a more general tendency to avoid descriptions which are too derogatory of the character of the One, Holy, Transcendent God. Such derogatory descriptions must be eliminated in some way.

##### (1) THE CONCEPT OF GOD BEING JEALOUS

One human emotion which the targumist might be expected to avoid, is that of jealousy. Jealousy belittles a man's character and, therefore, is offensive enough when it is found in a prophet or a saint, but in God -- that would be intolerable!<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>At least so one would think!

Twice (Zephaniah 1:18 and 3:8) the Targum substitutes פורענות ("vengeance") for קנאה<sup>1</sup> ("jealousy").

[1] ZEPHANIAH 1:18<sup>2</sup>

ובאש קנאחו האכל כל-הארץ	In the fire of his jealous wrath, all the earth shall be consumed;
ובאישת פורענותיה יסופון כל רשעי ארצא	And by the fire of His vengeance all the evil men of the earth will be consumed.

This translation safeguards the targumist's conception of Deity, both by eliminating the emotion of jealousy and by avoiding the implication that God would destroy the earth completely, for in the Targum it is only the evil men who are consumed.

In two places the verb, קנא ("to be jealous"), occurs in conjunction with קנאה ("jealousy"). The verb is rendered by the ithpael of פרע ("to be repaid, be revenged"), but קנא is translated literally. Yet in these two passages פורענות still occurs.

[2] ZECHARIAH 1:14

קנאתי לירושלם ולציון קנאה גדולה	I am exceedingly jealous for Jerusalem and Zion.
------------------------------------	--

---

<sup>1</sup>Only occurrences of this word in the Twelve.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. also Zephaniah 3:8.

מחפרע אנה פורעניא  
ירושלם וציון  
קנאה רבא

I take vengeance for [the  
avenging of] Jerusalem and  
Zion with great jealousy  
[zeal].

[3] ZECHARIAH 8:2

קנאתי לציון קנאה  
גדולה וחמה גדולה  
קנאתי לה

I am jealous for Zion with  
great jealousy, and I am  
jealous for her with great  
wrath.

מחפרע אנה פורענונה  
ציון קנאה רבא ורנז  
רב מן קדמי על עממיא  
דאקניאוהא

I really take vengeance on  
Zion with great jealousy  
(zeal) and there is great  
rage before Me upon the  
nations who have provoked  
her to jealousy.

The verb קנא ("to be jealous") occurs only once more  
in the Twelve. In this remaining passage the verb is trans-  
lated by חס ("to pity"), another anthropopathic expression:

[4] JOEL 2:18

ויקנא יהוה לארצו

Then the Lord became  
jealous for his land,

וחס יהוה על ארציה

And Yahweh had pity  
upon His land,

Possibly the targumist's selection of וחס ("and  
pitied") for ויקנא ("and was jealous") may have been in-  
fluenced by the appearance of ויחמל ("and had pity") in the  
second half of this verse.

The substantive, קנא ("jealous"), occurs only once  
(Nahum 1:2) in the Twelve. Here it occurs in a theological  
context. In this passage the Targum renders it as שפוט ("a  
judge"), an anthropomorphic term apparently acceptable to the

translator:

[5] NAHUM 1:2

אל קנוא ונקם	The Lord is a jealous
יהוה	God and avenging,
אלה דאין <sup>1</sup>	God is a judge . . .
[ופורען יהוה]	

The translations of these passages show that the Targum does not consistently avoid the ascription to Deity of the emotion jealousy, contrary to what was anticipated. Moreover, the targumist is not consistent in his translation of the Hebrew words for jealousy. Perhaps the situation would be clearer if there were any non-theological passages in the Twelve in which these words for jealousy occurred.

(2) THE CONCEPT THAT GOD HATES<sup>2</sup>

Whether the targumist attempted to avoid attributing to God the human emotion of hatred is very problematical. Usually he translated <sup>אב</sup> ("to hate") by an Aramaic word which means both "to remove" and "to loathe"<sup>3</sup> -- <sup>בב</sup>. In Amos 5:21 <sup>אב</sup> ("to hate"), the exact Aramaic equivalent of

<sup>1</sup>A free translation -- a characteristic of the Targum of Nahum.

<sup>2</sup>In Amos 6:8 the verb <sup>אב</sup> ("to loathe") occurs. This verb the targumist renders by <sup>בב</sup> ("to disgrace, make vile").

<sup>3</sup>Thus, in Hosea 9:15; Amos 6:8; Zechariah 8:17; Malachi 1:3.



שנא ("to hate"), and רחק<sup>1</sup> are used parallel to one another. Here רחק clearly means "to loathe" and makes it more probable that the targumist was using it in this sense in his translations of שנא ("to hate"). The only passage in which there is a substantial change occurs in Malachi 2:16<sup>2</sup>:

כי-שנא שלה	For he <sup>3</sup> hates divorce.
ארי אם סניח לה פטרה	For if you hate her, divorce her . . . . <sup>4</sup>

This translation is essentially the same as the Septuagint and, therefore, may reflect a defense of the Mosaic law of divorce<sup>5</sup>, possibly against the Christian teachings.

A consideration of the above passages suggests that the targumist did not attempt to avoid the idea that God could hate.

### (3) THE CONCEPT OF GOD REPENTING

The concept of repentance, however, was abhorrent to

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Amos 4:11 where רחק ("to remove, hate") translates הפך ("to overthrow").

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 88f.

<sup>3</sup>Following Revised Standard Version, footnote j, page 996.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. "wenn du sie hassest, entlasse sie." (Sellin, op. cit., p. 606). The targumist here is translating with a theological bias (so Sellin).

<sup>5</sup>See pages 88ff. The Targum changes "a denunciation of divorce into an explicit authorization thereof." (Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 60).

the translator, and he avoided such a suggestion. His avoidance of any ascription of repentance to Deity probably arose more from his objection to the inference that God was changeable than to any offense at the picture of a compassionate Deity. The verb, נחם ("to repent, be compassionate"), occurs nine times in connection with Deity.

In four instances נחם ("to repent, be compassionate") occurs where God is represented as repenting of the evil He originally had planned to do. In three passages, the targumist substitutes the intermediary device of the Memra:

[1] JOEL 2:13 L<sup>1</sup>

ונחם על-הרעה

And [God] repents of evil.

ומחייב מימריה  
מלאי תאה בישא

And His Word turns from  
doing evil.  
*bringing*

In the fourth passage, however, Memra is not inserted in the Targum:

[2] JONAH 3:10<sup>2</sup>

וינחם  
האלהים על-הרעה  
אשר-דבר לעשות-להם

God repented of the evil  
which he had said he  
would do to them;

וחב יהוה מן בישתא דנזר  
למי עבד להון

But Yahweh turned from  
the evil which He had  
decreed to do to them,

<sup>1</sup>See also Jonah 4:2; Zechariah 8:14.

<sup>2</sup>The Targum's "transl. is due to dogmatic scruples."  
(Mitchell, Smith, Bower, op. cit., p. 56).

In all four passages the verb נחם ("to repent") is translated by חנב ("to turn"); the fact that Memra is not used in Jonah 3:10 is all the more interesting because Memra occurs just two verses later in Jonah 4:2. This gives rise to the question: could Memra have been lost in the transmission of the text of the Targum in Jonah 3:10?

Elsewhere the Targum avoids this concept of God repenting in other ways. Twice the Targum adds the device: רונזיה ("His rage"):

[3] AMOS 7:3,6

נחם יהוה על-זאת

The Lord repented  
concerning this;

אחיב יהוה רונזיה  
מן דא

Yahweh caused His rage  
to turn from this.

In two other parallel passages the question was raised whether God would repent.

[4] JOEL 2:14<sup>1</sup>

מי יודע ישוב ונחם

Who knows whether he will  
not turn and repent,

מן ידע דאית בידיה  
חובין יחוב מינהון  
ויתרחם עלוהי

Who knows that there are in  
his hand sins, let him turn  
from them and compassion  
will be shown unto him.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Also Jonah 3:9.

<sup>2</sup>Kalisch [M.M., Bible Studies, Part II, The Book of Jonah (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1878), p. 261f] says, "... the Targum, anxious to remove anthropopathic notions, renders freely: 'whosoever is conscious of guilt, let him turn away therefrom and he will receive God's compassion' (ויתרחם; . . .); the Masorites are supposed to have followed the same interpretation, since they provided ישוב with a more strongly distinctive accent than נחם; and so also the Syr. ומרחם עליו. Rashi . . . and others . . ."; see pages 319f.

In the one passage where נחם clearly means "to be compassionate" or "to comfort", the Targum unhesitatingly translates it literally:

[5] ZECHARIAH 1:17

ונחם יהוה עוד את-  
ציון

And the Lord will again  
comfort Zion. . .

ונחם יהוה עוד את  
ציון

And Yahweh will again  
comfort Zion. . .

Finally, one very puzzling passage should be noted:

[6] HOSEA 11:8

יחד נכמרו נחומי

. . . my compassion grows  
warm and tender.

כחדא מתגללא רחמא  
אבתכון

At the same time the com-  
passion of your fathers  
has been rolled up.

This translation avoids the anthropopathism by attributing compassion to the forefathers of the Israelitish people rather than God.

Although there are two passages in which the targumist does not avoid the concept of God being compassionate or repentant, the remaining instances clearly show that the Targum usually avoids this anthropopathism.

(4) THE CONCEPT OF GOD BEING SORRY

In the one passage in the Twelve where God may be

described as mourning, etc., both the Septuagint<sup>1</sup> and the Targum change the person of the verbs from the first person to the third person. The Septuagint and the Targum differ only as to number<sup>2</sup>. Perhaps here in Micah 1:8 they understood that the speaker had shifted from God to the prophet.

### (5) THE CONCEPT OF GOD'S ANGER

Frequently the Hebrew words which denote anger are translated literally. In a few passages the Targum may be anti-anthropopathic.

#### [1] HABAKKUK 3:8

חֲבוּהָרִים חָרָה יְהוָה	Was thy wrath against the rivers, O Lord?
הוּא רָנָה מִן קִדְמוֹ יְהוָה	Was there anger from You, O Yahweh?

In this passage the targumist uses קִדְמוֹ and the impersonal third personal singular form of the verb. He follows

---

<sup>1</sup>See pages 84f.

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint is singular, and the Targum is plural.



essentially this same pattern in Nahum 1:2 and Zechariah 8:2<sup>1</sup>.

[2] NAHUM 1:2

ובעל חמה	. . . and wrathful; <sup>2</sup>
וסני חילא קדמוהי	And power is multiplied before Him.

In other passages intermediary devices or other changes have been introduced.

[3] HABAKKUK 3:8

אס-בים עברתך	. . . or thy indignation against the sea,
ובימא חורעתא בהון פורענות גבורתך	And against the sea you have made known to them the vengeance of your power,

This translation may be a softening. Likewise the translations in Hosea 11:9; Jonah 3:9<sup>3</sup>; Zephaniah 2:2; and 3:8 of חרון ("burning anger") as חקוק<sup>4</sup> ("strength") may be softenings. Finally, in Habakkuk 3:2<sup>5</sup> רנו ("rage, wrath") either is omitted in the Targum or else is translated as רעותך ("your will").

---

<sup>1</sup>See page 245.

<sup>2</sup>Literally "and a master of wrath".

<sup>3</sup>See pages 319f.

<sup>4</sup>In Nahum 1:6 the translation is אבאש/ח ("offence, displeasure").

<sup>5</sup>See page 325, footnote 1.

Since  $\eta\aleph$  ("nose, anger") is rendered always as anger and since many of the other Hebrew words which convey the idea of anger are translated literally or nearly so, the few examples of the seeming anti-anthropopathisms cannot establish the principle that the targumist sought to avoid the concept of God being angry.

#### (6) THE CONCEPT OF GOD BEING INDIGNANT

Perhaps the idea of God being indignant was more offensive to the targumist than the concept of God being angry. In Micah 7:9<sup>1</sup> the word  $\eta\aleph$  ("indignation") is either omitted or else translated  $\aleph\aleph$  ("a curse").

#### [1] MICAH 7:9

$\eta\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph$

I will bear the  
indignation of the Lord  
. . .

$\aleph\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph$   
 $\aleph\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph$

I will receive a curse from  
Yahweh . . .

It is very difficult to see how this rendering would be less objectionable to the targumist than the Masoretic Text.

#### [2] ZECHARIAH 1:12

---

<sup>1</sup>Only occurrence of  $\eta\aleph$  in the Twelve as applied to Deity.

<sup>2</sup>The Targum's "...  $\aleph\aleph$   $\aleph\aleph$  and  $\aleph\aleph$  are familiar methods of avoiding expressions that might seem to bring God unduly near to man's level:" (Taylor, op. cit., p. 173).

<sup>1</sup>אשר זעמחה זה שבעים  
שנה

. . . against which  
thou hast had indignation  
these seventy years?

<sup>2</sup>דאייחיתא עליהון לווס  
דנן שנעין שנין

. . . upon whom You have  
brought a curse these  
seventy years.

[3] MALACHI 1:4

לחעם אשר-זעם יהוה  
עד-עולם

. . . the people with  
whom the Lord is angry  
forever.

ועמא דאייחי יהוה  
עלהון לווס עד עלמא

And the people against  
whom Yahweh has brought  
a curse forever. . .

The translator clearly had a Hebrew text before him which was similar to, or identical with, the Masoretic Text. Moreover, the last two translations are probably not anti-anthropomorphic because זעם ("to be indignant") in Micah 6:10<sup>4</sup> is translated also by לווס ("a curse"):

ואיפח רוון זעומה

And the scant measure  
that is abominable?<sup>5</sup>

ומכילין דשקר מיתן  
לווס

And the measures of falsehood  
bring a curse?

Likewise the substantive, זעם ("indignation"), is

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 79f.

<sup>2</sup>A free translation (Rignall, *op. cit.*, p. 45).

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 80.

<sup>4</sup>זעם occurs here in a non-theological passage.

<sup>5</sup>American Jewish Translation.

not rendered consistently in the Targum. In Hosea 7:16<sup>1</sup> it is translated as עִיכּוּתָא ("trickery, insidiousness"), in Habakkuk 3:12<sup>2</sup> by לוּט ("a curse"), in Nahum 1:6<sup>3</sup> by פּוֹרְעָנוּת ("vengeance"), and in Zephaniah 3:8<sup>4</sup> by חִיכָהּ ("My Wrath").

Therefore, the Targum does not exhibit an anti-anthropomorphic tendency with respect to the concept of Deity being indignant, although the Targum does alter a greater percentage of passages involving עַם than it does those which depict God as angry.

#### (7) THE CONCEPT OF DEITY AS HAVING PLEASURE OR DESIRE

Usually the concept of Deity being pleased<sup>5</sup> (רָצָה)<sup>6</sup> is rendered literally, but twice the statement is softened by being recast into an impersonal form:

##### [1] HOSEA 8:13

יְהוָה לֹא רָצָה

. . . but the Lord has  
no delight in them.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 81.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 82f, and 318.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 83.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 83.

<sup>5</sup>רָצָה means "to be pleased" or "to accept".

<sup>6</sup>E.g., in Malachi 1:10 וּמִנְחָה לֹא-אֶרְצָה מִיָּדְכֶם ("and I will not accept an offering from your hand,") is translated as וְקִרְבֵּן לְרֵעוּא אֵיכְבִּיל מִיָּדְכֶם ("and a pleasing offering I will not accept from your hands,").

45

וקדם יהוה לא רעוא  
בהון

. . . and before Yahweh  
there is no pleasure in  
them.

[2] AMOS 5:22

לא ארצה

. . . I will not accept  
them,

לא לרעוא

. . . are not pleasing  
. . .

Another word ערב ("to be sweet, pleasing") occurs  
twice<sup>1</sup> in theological passages.

[3] HOSEA 9:4

ולא יערבו-לו

. . . and they shall not  
please him . . .

ולא יתקבלון לרערא

Neither will pleasure be  
accepted . . .

This translation avoids the anthropomorphism, but it  
clearly rests upon the Hebrew Text.

[4] MALACHI 3:4

וערבה ליהוה

Then [the offering of  
Judah and Jerusalem] will  
be pleasing to the Lord .  
. . .

ויתקבל קדם יהוה

There will be received  
before Yahweh . . .

The next word to be considered is נחם ("to be pleased,  
delighted"). This root occurs both as a noun and as a verb

---

<sup>1</sup>These are the only two occurrences in the Twelve; cf.  
the Septuagint (see page 87).

in theological passages.

[5] MALACHI 1:10<sup>1</sup>

אין-לי חפץ בכם	I have no pleasure in you,
לא רעוא קדמי בבון	There is no pleasure before Me in you . . .

The verb occurs in Micah 7:18<sup>2</sup> where the Targum translates it adequately by רעי ("to delight in", etc.).

[6] JONAH 1:14

כאשר חפצה עשית	. . . [for thou] . . . hast done as it pleased thee.
כמא דרעוא קדמך ענדת	According as there is will (pleasure) before you, you have done.

This verse might be offensive both because it is anthropopathic and because it could be interpreted as meaning that God is capricious. The targumist has softened the statement slightly.

[7] HOSEA 6:6

כי חסד חפצתי	For I desire steadfast love . . .
--------------	--------------------------------------

---

<sup>1</sup>Only occurrence of the noun in a theological passage in the Twelve.

<sup>2</sup>The only four occurrences of the verb in the Twelve are discussed here.



ארי בעבדי חסדא  
רעווא קדמי [מדינא]

Because with those who  
are practicing mercy  
there is more pleasure  
before me than [in  
sacrifices] . . .

[8] MALACHI 2:17

ובחם הוא חפץ

. . . and he delights  
in them.

ובחון רעוא קדמוהי

. . . and there is  
pleasure before Him in  
them.

The translation of these last two passages avoids the anthropopathism by the use of the impersonal third person singular form of the verb and קדם ("before") with the appropriate pronominal suffix.

Only one passage in the Twelve ascribes the emotion of desire (בואהי) to Deity. In this passage, Hosea 10:10<sup>1</sup>, the Targum avoids the anthropopathism by translating בואהי ("in my desire"<sup>2</sup>) as במימרי ("by My Word").

An examination of the passages and words which depict Deity as exhibiting the emotions of pleasure or desire reveals that the targumist does not avoid this anthropopathism consistently. The verb רצה ("to be pleased, accept") usually is translated literally, although twice the Targum avoids the

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 87 and 208f.

<sup>2</sup>Revised Standard Version, footnote s, page 943.

anthropopathism. The targumist softens the verses which contain the verb ערב by the use of the impersonal, third person singular, passive form of the verb. The noun, חפץ, and the verb, חפץ, are translated usually as substantives by קדם with an appropriate pronominal suffix.

These passages demonstrate that the targumist usually attempts to soften or avoid the anthropopathic expressions of the Hebrew. This fact makes it probable that the Targum of Hosea 10:10 (last example, above) is an anti-anthropopathism.

## 2. ALTERATIONS IN THE TARGUM REGARDING GOD'S POSSESSIONS

In several places in the Twelve God is referred to as having possessions which normally only human beings have. Many passages which ascribe these possessions to God are left unaltered in the Targum, and at times the targumist even adds possessions in places where none exist in the corresponding Hebrew text. In a few instances, however, especially in the third chapter of Habakkuk, perhaps the targumist was offended by this type of anthropomorphisms.

### (1) HABAKKUK 3:11b

לאור חציון יהלכו

. . . at the light of  
thine arrows as they sped,

עמך בימימך  
איתגברו

. . . Your people pre-  
vailed with your Word. . .

### (2) HABAKKUK 3:11c

לונה ברק חניתך

. . . at the flash of thy  
glittering spear.

בחקוף ניצחון גבורתך

... in the strength  
of the victory of Your  
Power.

(3) ZECHARIAH 9:14

ויצא כנרן חצו

... and his arrow  
[will] go forth like  
lightning;

ויהיו נפיקין כנרין  
פיתחמוהי<sup>1</sup>

And His decrees will go  
out like lightning;

In each of these examples the anthropomorphic concept of Deity having physical weapons is avoided in the Targum. A change of greater importance is the substitution of Memra for God's staff in Micah 7:14<sup>2</sup>. Other interesting changes are:

(4) JOEL 1:7

שם נפני לשמה

It has laid waste my  
vines,

שוי פירי נפני  
עמי לצרו

He (it) set the fruit of  
the vines of My people a  
desolation. . .

The targumist added here פירי ("the fruit of") and עמי ("My people") which eliminated the anthropomorphism by the alteration of "My vines" to "the vines of My people". This change may indicate also a pro-Israel bias.

(5) HABAKKUK 3:8<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>T. interprets חצו as פיתחמוהי . . ." (Jansma, op. cit., p. 75).

<sup>2</sup>See pages 197f.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Habakkuk 3:15.

כי תרכב על-  
סוסין  
ארי איתוליתא בנכורחך  
בדיל קיימך על  
מרכבה יקרך

\* \* \* when thou didst  
ride upon thy horses,

\* \* \* because You are  
revealed for the sake of *in your  
might*  
Your covenant upon the  
chariots of your Glory,

In this passage the Targum substitutes על מרכבה יקרך  
("upon the chariots of your Glory") for על-סוסין ("upon thy  
horses").

(6) NAHUM 1:2

נקם יהוה לצריו ונוסר  
הוא לאיבין

\* \* \* the Lord takes  
vengeance on his  
adversaries and keeps  
wrath for his enemies.

עתיד יהוה לאיחפרעא  
מסנאי עמיה וברגז חסין  
מבעלי דבנוהי

*is about*  
Yahweh comes to take  
vengeance upon those  
hating His people and with  
vehement wrath against ~~the~~  
~~masters (Baalim)~~ of their  
(His) enemies.

This translation probably reflects a pro-Israel bias of the translator; it hardly avoids the anthropomorphism -- although it does eliminate the idea that God had enemies and/or adversaries.

There are many other minor changes in the Targum which may reflect an anti-anthropomorphic tendency to avoid the ascription of possessions to Deity. Undoubtedly the most important (and consistent) effort to avoid attributing possessions to God is the treatment of passages which refer to the paths or ways of God. Of course, these passages have

been interpreted spiritually by the targumist<sup>1</sup>, and all the references to God's paths or ways have been altered in the Targum:

## (7) MICAH 4:2

וַיִּוְרְנוּ מִדְּרָכָיו וְנִלְכָּה  
בְּאַרְחֵתָיו

. . . that he may teach  
us his ways and we may  
walk in his paths.

<sup>2</sup> וַיְלַמֵּנוּ מִדְּרָכָיו  
דְּחֻקֵּי קִדְמוֹתָיו וְנִלְכָּה  
בְּאַרְחֵתָיו

And He will teach us the  
paths of righteousness  
before Him, and we will  
walk in the instruction  
of His law.

## (8) ZECHARIAH 3:7 L

אִם-בְּדַרְכֵי הַלֵּךְ

If you will walk in my  
ways . . .

אִם בְּאַרְחֵת דְּחֻקֵּי  
קִדְמוֹתָיו

If you will walk before  
Me in the paths of  
righteousness . . .

## (9) MALACHI 2:9 L

אֲשֶׁר אֵינוֹכֶם שֹׁמְרִים  
אֶת-דְּרָכָי

. . . inasmuch as you have  
not kept my ways . . .

כִּמָּא דְּלִיחִיכּוֹן נִסְרִין  
יְהוָה אֲרֵחֵן דְּחֻקֵּי קִדְמוֹתָיו

. . . inasmuch as you have  
not kept the paths of  
righteousness before Me. .

This type of anti-anthropomorphism only partially is

<sup>1</sup>Even as most commentators have.

<sup>2</sup>"There is nothing noteworthy in the Targ.: its paraphrases are in its ordinary manner: --" (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 93).

considered here because most alterations are of a textual nature which makes it impossible to know certainly whether the alterations were caused by a variant or an originally corrupt text or by an anti-anthropomorphic bias. The examples cited above are probably instances of changes motivated by a theological bias<sup>1</sup>. The consistent alterations of God's paths (or ways) are clearly anti-anthropomorphic.

### 3. ACTIONS OF DEITY WHICH ARE ANTHROPOMORPHIC

Several of these actions have already been discussed in the preceding chapter in connection with the physical form or portion of a human body which they suggest. There are also, however, many actions which convey an anthropomorphic picture but which do not bring to mind either the entire form of a man (or other physical form) or suggest any part of the human body. Yet these particular actions are intimately connected with human life.

#### (1) GOD DESCRIBED AS SAVING

The targumist considers that very few of these actions are sufficiently derogatory of Deity to necessitate alteration. Thus, out of the many instances<sup>2</sup> in which God is described as a Savior or as saving His people, there is only

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Habakkuk 3:8; see page 315.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., in Hosea 13:4; Micah 7:7; Habakkuk 3:13,18; Zechariah 8:7,13; 9:16; 10:6; 12:7 where the translation is fairly literal.



one place where this concept is altered by the use of Memra  
(מימרא):

[1] HOSEA 1:7

והושעתים ביהוה  
אלהיהם

. . . and I will deliver  
them by the Lord their  
God;

ואיפרוקיננון במימרא  
דיהוה אלההון

. . . and I will redeem  
them by the Word of  
Yahweh their God;

In two passages the idea of redemption by the Word of  
God is found in the Targum, whereas any idea of God's  
redeeming or saving is absent in the Hebrew:

(a) HOSEA 3:2

ואכרה לי

So I bought her [for  
myself] . . .

ופרקתיננון במימרי

And I will redeem them  
by My Word . . .

The targumist has interpreted this passage allegorically,  
having assumed that the subject is God and not the prophet.

(b) MICAH 7:10<sup>1</sup>

איו יהוה אלהיך

Where is the Lord your  
God?

אן דאיתפריקת  
במימרא דיהוה אלהך

Where are you who were  
redeemed by the Word of  
Yahweh your God?

---

<sup>1</sup>So also Joel 2:17; see page 300, footnote 2.

The Hebrew passage might have been offensive to the targumist because it implies that God is not omnipresent<sup>1</sup>. The translation avoids this offensive implication and may reflect also a pro-Israel bias.

Aside from Hosea 1:7 only one other passage avoids the anthropomorphic description of God as a Savior:

[2] HABAKKUK 1:2

ולא חושיע	... and thou wilt not save?
הלא יוכלא קדמך למפרק	Is there not power before you to deliver (redeem)?

(2) GOD DESCRIBED AS FINDING

The idea of God finding Israel occurs only in Hosea 9:10 E in the Twelve. This concept the Targum avoids by substituting Memra for God and altering the verb:

מצאתי ישראל	... I found Israel.
ערע מימרי לישראל	My Word meets (calls to) Israel.

(3) GOD DESCRIBED AS HEDGING OR WALLING UP

The three passages in the Twelve which attribute such actions to Deity are altered in the Targum.

[1] HOSEA 2:8(6)a

---

<sup>1</sup> . . . it would seem that the Targumist on the Prophets avoids a question which would imply the possibility of Jahweh's absence." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 175).

לכן הנני-שך את-  
דרכך

Therefore I will hedge  
up your<sup>1</sup> way . . .

בכין האנא מקלקיל  
יה אורחתך

Therefore, I will cast  
out your ways . . .

In the same verse God is also described as walling up:

[2] HOSEA 2:8(6)b

ונדרתי את-נדרה

. . . and I will build a  
wall . . .

ואפסיק כמא דמפסקין<sup>2</sup>  
בכוהליא

. . . and I will cut off  
as those who cut off with  
walls . . .

The Targum avoids stating that God hedges up, but the translation of ונדרתי ("and I will build a wall") as אפסיק ("and I will cut off") is as anthropomorphic as the Hebrew.

[3] AMOS 9:11

ונדרתי את-  
פרציהן

. . . and [I] repair [wall  
up] its breeches,

ואיבני יה כרכיהון

. . . and I will found  
their turrets,  
*or fortified towers*

Perhaps the Targum softens the anthropomorphism here.

(4) GOD DEPICTED AS A HEALER<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Following Revised Standard Version, footnote f, p. 936.

<sup>2</sup>ואפסיק (so Sebök, Harper [so Harper, op. cit., p. 236]).

<sup>3</sup>The only passage in which the non-theological use of רפא ("heal") occurs in the Twelve is Hosea 5:13. In this case the Targum translates literally.

In the majority of passages where God is described as a Healer, the Targum differs from the Hebrew<sup>1</sup>.

[1] HOSEA 7:1

כרפאי לישראל	... when I [God] would heal Israel,
כמיחבועי חובי ישראל	... as the sins of Israel were sought out,

The use of the impersonal passive [בעי ("to seek out")] to translate רפא ("to heal") eliminates God as being the actor.

[2] HOSEA 11:3

ולא ידעו כי רפאחם	... but they did not know that I healed them.
ולא ידעין דמן קדמי מחרחם עליהון	... but they did not know that from before Me there is compassion unto them.

The use here of קדמי ("before me") avoids the anthropomorphism.

[3] HOSEA 14:5(4)

ארפא משובתם	I will heal their faith- lessness;
איקבלינו בחיובתהון	I will receive them in their turning;

The selection of קבל ("to receive") to translate

---

<sup>1</sup>In Hosea 6:1 the Targum retains the idea of the Hebrew.

רפא ("to heal") softens the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew.

The Aramaic translations, especially of Hosea 7:1 and 14:5(4), suggest that the targumist may have possessed a different text or else misread his text.

#### (5) THE DESCRIPTION OF DEITY AS DEFENDING

Twice in the Twelve God is described as defending (גן) people. In both passages the targumist softens<sup>1</sup> the anthropomorphism to an anthropopathism -- to have compassion:

#### ZECHARIAH 9:15<sup>2</sup>

יהוה צבאות יגן עליהם

The Lord of Hosts will protect [defend] them,

יהוה צבאות ירחם עליהם

Yahweh of Hosts will pity them,<sup>3</sup>

#### (6) THE DESCRIPTION OF GOD AS SPREADING OUT

This anthropomorphism is not rendered consistently. In Hosea 7:12 פש ("to spread out") is translated by the corresponding Aramaic verb, פש ("to spread out"). In Zechariah 2:10(6), the Targum uses a different verb although it conveys the essential meaning of the Hebrew:

<sup>1</sup>The "translation [the Septuagint] perhaps manifests a desire to tone down the strong figures of the passage . . . More especially is this tendency observable in the Targum," (Wright [C.H.H.], op. cit., p. 573).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. also Zechariah 12:8.

<sup>3</sup>Wright, op. cit., p. 573.

## ZECHARIAH 2:10(6)

כי כארבע רוחות  
השמים פרשתי אתכם

. . . for I have spread  
you abroad as the four  
winds of the heavens,

ארי כארבע רוחי  
שמיא בדרית יתכון

. . . for as the four  
winds of the heaven I  
have scattered you,

The situation is a little more confusing in connection with נטה ("to stretch out"). In two passages<sup>1</sup> where it occurs, in connection with God's hand, the targumist translates the verb by רום ("to raise, lift up") which is also anthropomorphic. Once<sup>2</sup> it is translated by הלי ("to lift up, suspend, hand"). In the last passage to be considered, Hosea 11:4<sup>3</sup>, ואט ("and I bent down") is translated by אטנתי<sup>4</sup> ("I caused to multiply"). The different translations suggest that the translator was not motivated by an anti-anthropomorphic bias in respect to the verb, נטה<sup>5</sup>.

## (7) THE DESCRIPTION OF GOD AS TEACHING (SHOWING)

In like manner, the Hebrew verbs meaning "to teach" or

<sup>1</sup>Zephaniah 1:4 L; 2:13 L; see page 212.

<sup>2</sup>Zechariah 12:1; this passage conveys the essential meaning of the Hebrew.

<sup>3</sup>See page 199; cf. the Septuagint (see page 39).

<sup>4</sup>The Targum = ואיטיב (Ruben, *op. cit.*, p. 19).

<sup>5</sup>In Zephaniah 1:4 L; 2:13 L; Zechariah 12:1 the Hebrew gal stem occurs; in Hosea 11:4, the hiphil stem. In two non-theological passages the hiphil stem also occurs (Amos 2:7f; Malachi 3:5). The niphal stem occurs twice, Amos 5:12 and Zechariah 1:16, both in non-theological connotations.



"to show" in theological passages have been given a variety of translations. One verb, רנל (hiphil stem), occurs only once: רנל = teach to walk, not teach.

[1] HOSEA 11:3

ואנכי חרנלתי לאפרים	Yet it was I who taught Ephraim to walk,
ואנא במלאך שליח מן קדמי דברית	. . . and I, with my Angel (messenger) sent from Me, lead . . .

Perhaps the ב in חרנל should be translated as "by the means of". If so, the Targum avoids the anthropomorphism. If ב does not have the meaning of "by the means of", then the idea of God's teaching has been altered to a concept of God, Himself, leading.

The hiphil of ירה ("to show, teach") is translated literally in Micah 4:2<sup>1</sup> by the verb למד, ("to teach"), but twice the targumist does not make a literal translation, viz:

[2] HOSEA 10:12<sup>2</sup>

ויורה צדק לכם	. . . and teach you righteousness . . . <sup>3</sup>
וייתי זכוון לכוון	. . . and He will bring justice to you.

<sup>1</sup>See page 262; cf. the Septuagint (see page 94).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Hosea 6:3 (see page 317f.) where the Lord's coming is compared to the spring rains.

<sup>3</sup>Following the Syriac, Targum, Vulgate, Dathe, Hitzig, Henderson, Pusey, and Orelli (so Harper, op. cit., p. 356).

Whether ירה (hiphil) here means that God will rain or teach righteousness, the Targum softens the anthropomorphism.

The final verb to be considered, ראה ("hiphil = "to show"), is translated literally except in Habakkuk:

[3] HABAKKUK 1:3

למה	
חראני און	Why dost thou make me
	see [or show me] . . . ?

למה אנה הוי אונסין	Why do I see oppressors?
--------------------	--------------------------

This translation avoids the statement that God shows the prophet wickedness, etc., which would be objectionable either as an anthropomorphism or because of the translator's conception of the character of Deity. The translation, however, does state that the prophet sees, which retains the essential meaning of the Masoretic Text.

(8) OTHER ANTHROPOMORPHIC DESCRIPTIONS OF DEITY

Three other translations of passages involving anthropomorphic descriptions of Deity remain to be considered:

[1] HOSEA 6:5

על-כן חצבתי	Therefore I have <sup>held</sup> <del>hewn</del> them <sup>back</sup> .
בנביאים	by the prophets,
על דאחרתינון <sup>†</sup>	Therefore, I warned them
בשליחות נביי	by the embassy of the prophets,

God's hewing (חצב) has been softened to God's <sup>holding back</sup> warning (יחר), although this rendering is still a good interpretation

<sup>†</sup> Walton's Polyglott reads מוחרתי (I warned).

Lagarde's Prophètes Chaldaïques has מוחרתי (I held back).  
Research based on Lagarde's *Ch.*

of the Hebrew.

[2] JOEL 4(3):8<sup>1</sup>

וּמְכַרְתִּי אֶת-בְּנֵיכֶם	I will sell your sons
	* * *
וְאִמְסַר יְהוָה בְּנֵיכֶם	And I will deliver
	your sons. . .

This translation is still anthropomorphic, although it probably softens the anthropomorphism to some extent. Probably the translation reflects a pro-Israel bias. The assumption that the translation reflects a theological bias is confirmed by the literal translation of מכר ("to sell") in the same verse when it is used in a non-theological sense.

[3] ZECHARIAH 3:9

חֲנוּנִי כִּפְתָּה פִּתְחָה	. . . I will engrave its
	inscription,
הֵאנָה נִלִּי חֲזִיחָה	. . . I will reveal its
	[the stone's] vision,

In this passage the Targum is interpretive although it avoids the anthropomorphism.

— — — — —

These translations seem to clearly establish the fact that certain concepts found in the Hebrew were considered to be too anthropomorphic or too derogatory of God to be translated literally, while other actions were not so considered.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 96f.

#### 4. ACTIONS OF MEN TOWARD GOD WHICH IMPLY THAT HE IS ANTHROPOMORPHIC

Some of the relationships of man to God, which directly or indirectly impute form to God, are retained, as, for example, the idea of finding God in Hosea 5:6, but many others have been altered.

##### (1) KNOWING GOD

Several very interesting translations occur in connection with the concept of man knowing God.

##### [1] HOSEA 8:2<sup>1</sup>

אלהי ידענוך ישראל	My God, we Israel know thee.
כען ידענא ארי ליה אלה בר קינן פרוקנא ארי אנחנא ע אמן ישראל	Now we know that no God except You has redeemed us because we are Your people Israel. . .

This translation avoids stating that Israel knows God. Moreover, it reflects a pro-Israel bias by the additions made.

##### [2] HOSEA 6:6

ודעה אלהים מעלות	. . . the knowledge of God, rather than burnt offerings.
ועבדי דיחיה ממסקי עלוון	. . . and serving the law of Yahweh rather than offering whole burnt offerings.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Hosea 13:4, where the Targum translates literally, and Hosea 4:6 (see page 275), where the change in the Targum reflects solely a pro-Israel bias.

The Targum interprets the knowledge of God as serving the law. Furthermore, this rendering reflects the growing importance of the law.

[3] HOSEA 5:4

ואת־יהוה לא ידעו

. . . and they know not the Lord.

ואולפן מן קדם יהוה  
לא תבעו

. . . and they do not seek teaching from (of) Yahweh.

The addition of אולפן ("teaching") and the translation of ידעו ("they know") as תבעו ("they seek") softens the anthropomorphic implication and also may illustrate the increased importance of the cultic instruction.

The remaining five passages which refer to knowing God are translated with the addition of a derivative of דחל ("to fear, worship").

[4] HOSEA 2:22(20)

וידעת את־יהוה

. . . and you will know the Lord.

ותדעין למדחל מן  
קדם יהוה

. . . and you will know to fear (worship) before Yahweh.

[5] HOSEA 4:1

ואין־דעת אלהים  
בארץ

. . . and no knowledge of God in the land;

וליה דמחלכין  
בדחלתא דיהוה  
בארעא

. . . and there are none who are walking with in the fear of Yahweh in the land;

[6] Hosea 4:6<sup>1</sup>

כי אתה הדעת	... because you have
מאסת	rejected knowledge,
ארי את מדע דחלת	... because you hated
קצתא	to know My fear,

## [7] HOSEA 6:3

ונדעה נרדפה לדעת	Let us know, let us press
את-יהוה	on to know the Lord;
ונילף נירדוף למידע	We will learn, we will
יה דחלתא דיהוה	strive to know the fear
	of Yahweh;

## [8] HABAKKUK 2:14

כי תמלא הארץ לדעת	For the earth will be
את-כבוד יהוה	filled with the knowledge
	of the glory of the Lord,
ארי תיתמלי ארעא	Because the earth will be
למידע יה דחלתא	filled in order to know
דיהוה	the fear of Yahweh.

These five passages have all been interpreted allegorically. The last translation suggests the targumist might have had a text in which כבוד ("glory") was lacking, and, therefore, he added דחלתא ד- ("the fear of") as in earlier passages.

## (2) TEMPTING GOD

Three times the verb בִּחַ ("to try, test, tempt") occurs in the Twelve. In Zechariah 13:9 the translation is

<sup>1</sup>See pages 382ff for Hosea 4:6a.



essentially literal<sup>1</sup>, but in the two passages in Malachi the targumist softens the Hebrew by the use of קדם ("before").

[1] MALACHI 3:10<sup>2</sup>

ובחנוני נא בזאת

. . . and thereby put me  
to the test,

ונסו כען קדמי  
בהרא

. . . and thereby put to  
the test in My presence,

[2] MALACHI 3:15<sup>3</sup>

גם בחנו אלהים

. . . but when they put  
God to the test . . .

אף נסיוא קדם יהוה

. . . also they have put  
to the test in My presence  
. . .

(3) HEARING GOD

For man to hear (שמע) God implies that God has an audible voice and, therefore, a mouth. Usually the Targum avoids stating that man can hear God.

[1] HOSEA 9:17 L<sup>4</sup>

כי לא שמעו לו

. . . because they have not  
hearkened to him;

ארי לא קבילו  
למימריה

. . . because they have not  
received (accepted) His Word;

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum slightly softens the Hebrew.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 106.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 106f.

<sup>4</sup>So also Zechariah 1:4 L.

The Targum alters the verb שמע ("hear") to קבל ("receive, accept") and substitutes מימריה ("His Word") for the personal pronoun "him". The verb קבל ("to receive, accept") is the usual translation in the Targum<sup>1</sup> for שמע ("to hear"). Both שמע ("to hear, listen to"), and a synonymous verb קשב ("to hear, listen") occur in two passages, (Zechariah 1:4; 7:11).

[2] ZECHARIAH 7:11

וימאנו להקשיב...  
ואזניהם הכבירו משמוע

But they refused to  
hearken . . . and stopped  
their ears that they might  
not hear.

וסריבו לקבלו....ואורניהו  
יקרו מלמשמע

And they were unwilling to  
accept . . . and they made  
their ears heavy that they  
might not hear.

In this passage קשב is translated by קבל ; whereas שמע is translated literally.

[3] ZECHARIAH 1:4 L

ולא שמעו ולא-הקשיבו  
אלי

But they did not hear  
or heed me,

ולא קבילו ולא אציתו  
למימרי

But they did not receive  
nor listen to My Word.

(4) CALLING (CRYING) TO GOD

Whenever man calls (cries) to God, he is assuming

<sup>1</sup> קבל translated שמע in Amos 8:11 and Zechariah 1:4 L; in Habakkuk 3:2 the targumist translates שמע literally but also adds ובורח . He also translates שמע literally in Micah 6:1.

that God possesses an ear with which to hear him. Usually the verbs קרא ("to call") and נעץ ("to cry"), if they occur in statements where man is said to cry (call) to God, are translated by קדם צלי<sup>1</sup> ("to pray before"); for example:

## HOSEA 7:7 E

אין-קרא בהם אלי	... and none of them calls upon me.
דמצלי מיןחון קדמי	... who prays among them before Me.

In one passage (Hosea 2:18 [16] L<sup>2</sup>) this standard procedure is not followed. In this passage there are several offensive ideas in addition to the anthropomorphism of calling to God; i.e., the anthropomorphic description of God as "husband" and the offensive (cultically) descriptive term of Deity as "Baal". The targumist's allegorical interpretation of this chapter and these additional offensive terms probably were the decisive factors which caused the targumist to vary from his standard translational pattern in respect to קרא.

In any case, the Targum consistently avoids this anthropomorphic description<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Hosea 7:14; Jonah 1:6,14, (Ginsburger, op. cit., p. 280, incorrectly lists Jonah 1:4. Perhaps he meant 1:6 or 1:14; if so, then an L should be added after either 1:6 or 1:14).

<sup>2</sup>See page 200.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. also the verb דבר ("to speak") in Hosea 7:13 E (see page 293) and in Hosea 14:3(2) E where אמרו אליו ("... say to him,") is rendered as אימרו קדמוהי ("... speak before Him").

## (5) SEEING GOD

The Targum naturally would be expected to avoid stating that one could see God. A statement that God could be seen implies strongly that God has a physical form.

Twice the anti-anthropomorphic conception of Deity was safeguarded by the introduction of the Glory of God:

## [1] AMOS 9:1

ראיתי אה-אדני	I saw the Lord . . .
חזיתי יה יקרא דיהוה <sup>1</sup>	I saw the glory of the Lord . . .

## [2] HABAKKUK 3:10

ראוך יחילו הרים	The mountains saw thee, and withered;
באתגליותך על סורא דסיני חזו יקרך	When You were revealed upon Mount <del>Zion</del> , they saw Your glory . . .

*Sinai*

In both these passages the targumist makes clear that no one has seen God, but that, in any revelation of Deity, the people see God's glory.

In two other passages the passive of גלי ("to be revealed") translates ראה ("to see"):

## [3] ZECHARIAH 9:14

---

<sup>1</sup>"The Targum paraphrases," (Cripps, op. cit., p. 255).

ויהוה עליהם יראה	Then the Lord will appear over them,
ויהוה עליהון יתגלי	And Yahweh will be revealed over them,

## [4] MALACHI 3:2

בהראותו	. . . when he appears?
באיתגליותו	. . . when he is revealed?

In Zechariah 12:10 נבט ("to look"), a cognate verb, occurs. In this passage the Targum translates by בעי מן קדם ("to seek before") thus avoiding the anthropomorphism:

## [5] ZECHARIAH 12:10

והביטו אלי	. . . when they look on me. . . <sup>1</sup>
ויבעו מן קדמי	. . . and they shall pray before Me. . . <sup>2</sup>

This clause occurs in a passage which the early Christians interpreted as referring to Christ.

## [6] MICAH 7:7

Finally, in this verse (Micah 7:7) the Targum translates אצפה ("I will look [to God]") as א'בוע ("I will exult")<sup>3</sup> and adds Memra:

<sup>1</sup>Following the Revised Standard Version footnote s, p. 992.  
<sup>2</sup>So C.H.H. Wright, op. cit., p. 587.

<sup>3</sup>"On the other hand the Targumist was unfamiliar with the precise idea expressed in our verse, an idea quite suitable to the context, and was misled by his familiarity with the passages where rejoicing in God is the theme; the Targ. on Hab. iii.18 contains the very words employed here . . ." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 171).

וְאֵנִי בִיהוָה אֶצְמָא

But as for me, I will  
look to the Lord,

וְאֵנִי בְּמִימְרֵי דִיהוָה  
אֵיבֹועַ

But as for me, I will  
exult in the Word of  
Yahweh.

Therefore, the Targum everywhere denies that God  
might be seen by men.

#### (6) LEANING ON GOD

The idea of leaning (relying) on God was so anthropo-  
morphic that the Memra was used as a substitute for God.

#### [1] MICAH 3:11

וְעַל-יְהוָה יִשְׁעוּ

. . . yet they lean upon  
the Lord . . .

וְעַל מִימְרֵי דִיהוָה  
רְחִיצִין

. . . and upon the Word  
of Yahweh they will  
lean . . .

#### [2] NAHUM 1:7 L<sup>2</sup>

Apparently the targumist<sup>3</sup> considered the idea of taking  
refuge in God to be essentially the equivalent of leaning on  
God:

וִידַע הָסִי בּוֹ

. . . he knows those who  
take refuge in him.

<sup>1</sup>"For the usual בִּיהוָה is found here." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 171).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 108f.

<sup>3</sup>The Targum has spiritualized here (so Halidar, op. cit., p. 26).



ונלי קדמוהי דרחיצו  
על מימריה

... and those who lean  
upon His Word are  
revealed before Him.

The scarcity of passages in which these verbs occur in the Twelve makes it impossible to prove by them that here the targumist is anti-anthropomorphic.

### (7) SEEKING GOD

Frequently the Targum avoids this anthropomorphism by the use of קדם ("before") with יהוה or an appropriate suffix:

#### [1] ZEPHANIAH 1:6d

ולא-דרשהו

... or inquire [seek]  
of him.

ולא בעו מן קדמוהי

... nor sought before  
Him.

The verb דרש with this translation occurs only in this one place in the Twelve<sup>1</sup>. Usually בעי ("to seek") translates the Hebrew verb בקש ("to seek"). This translation is especially interesting because בקש also occurs in this verse (see page 284 for its translation). The targumist may have intended the pronominal suffix יהי ("him") to refer either to Yahweh or to the Fear of Yahweh (see page 284).

#### [2] HOSEA 7:10

<sup>1</sup>It also occurs in Hosea 10:12 (page 283) and Amos 5:4,6 (page 284 - note also footnote 3, same page).

ולא בקשהו	. . . nor seek
ולא בעו מן קדמוהי	. . . nor seek Him,

Three times the targumist adds אולפן ("teaching, his translation of the thought that man was seeking God:

[3] HOSEA 5:6<sup>1</sup>

לבקש את-יהוה	. . . to seek the Lord,
למיחבב אולפן	. . . to seek teaching
מן קדם יהוה	from Yahweh,

Since the concept of seeking God is closely connected to the concept of worshipping Him, the addition of פולחנא ("worship") and דחלתא ("fear, worship") by the targumist is not surprising.

[4] HOSEA 3:5 L

ובקשו את-יהוה	. . . and seek the Lord
אלהיהם	their God,
ויחבבון ית פולחנא	. . . and (they) will
דיהוה אלההון	seek the worship of Yahweh
	their God.

[5] HOSEA 10:12

ועת לדרוש את-יהוה	. . . for it is the time
	to seek the Lord,
חובו לדחלתא	. . . return to the fear
דיהוה	(worship) of Yahweh.

---

<sup>1</sup>This same method of translation also occurs in Zechariah 8:21f.

Could the targumist perhaps have read שבו (or חוּבו), "return", for וַעַן? Usually when the Targum adds דחלתא ("fear, worship"), the targumist translates the different Hebrew verbs by בעי ("to seek").

[6] HOSEA 5:15 L<sup>1</sup>

ישחרנני	. . . they seek me,
יחבֵּעוּן דחלתא	. . . they will seek My fear (worship),

[7] ZEPHANIAH 1:6c<sup>2</sup>

ואשר לא-בקשו את-יהוה	. . . who do not seek the Lord . . .
ודלא חבֵּעוּ דחלתא דיהוה	. . . and who have not sought the fear (worship) of Yahweh . . .

[8] AMOS 5:4 L<sup>3</sup>

דרשונני	Seek me . . .
חבֵּעוּ דחלתא	Seek My fear . . .

The only passage of a theological nature in which no

<sup>1</sup>Earlier in this same verse the clause וּבִקְשׁוּ פָנַי (" . . . and seek my face,") is translated in the Targum as (" . . . and they will seek before Me,") יִבְעוּן כִּן קֳדָמִי. Probably the reason that דחלתא was not added here is that the targumist believed that his translation of פָּנַי ("My face") as קֳדָמִי ("before Me") was an adequate safeguard against the anthropomorphism.

<sup>2</sup>The same verb (בִּקֵּשׁ) occurs also in Zephaniah 2:3 where the Targum also translates as בִּעֵי and adds דחלתא.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Amos 5:6 L where the Targum also adds דחלתא and translates דִּרְשׁ as בִּעֵי.

alteration occurs is in Malachi 3:1. The targumist here may have understood that הארון ("the Lord") in the clause הארון אשר אתם מבקשים ("... the Lord whom you are seeking . . .") referred to the previously mentioned angel (מלאכי = "My messenger or angel") or to some other intermediary.

---

The passages just quoted clearly demonstrate that the targumist avoided the anthropomorphic expression of "seeking God". Instead the Targum has men seeking the fear or worship of God. A few times the Targum describes men as seeking in His presence (or before Him) or as seeking teaching from God.

#### (8) COMING BEFORE (OR MEETING) GOD

The idea of meeting God or coming before Him does not occur too frequently in the Twelve. Since the idea of coming before (קדם) God is associated closely with the act of worshipping Deity, it is not surprising that the Targum spiritualizes its translation of קדם ("to come before") by using the verb פלח ("to worship").

##### [1] MICAH 6:6

במה אקדם יהוה... האקדמו	With what shall I come before the Lord, . . . Shall I come before him . . .
במה אפלח קדם יהוה... האפלח קדמוהי	With what shall I worship before Yahweh? . . . Shall I worship before Him . . .

##### [2] AMOS 4:12

הכון לקראת-  
אלהיך  
איתקשם לקבל אולפן  
אוריחא דאלהך

. . . prepare to meet  
your God,  
Be prepared to take up  
the teaching of the Law  
of your God . . .

The targumist, perhaps influenced by the increased importance of the Law to him, has avoided the anthropomorphism both by his selection of the verb קבל and by the addition of אולפן אוריחא ("the teaching of the Law [of]").

#### (9) WALKING WITH (GOING AFTER) GOD

The targumist usually avoided the concept of walking with (going after) God by the addition of פולחנא ("worship") or דלחחא ("fear, worship").

#### [1] HOSEA 11:10<sup>1</sup>

אחרי יהוה ילכו	They shall go (walk) after the Lord,
בחר פולחנא דיהוה יהכון	They will walk (go) after the worship of Yahweh.

#### [2] MICAH 6:8 L

והצנע לכת עם- אלהיך	. . . and to walk humbly with your God?
<sup>2</sup> והוי צניע להלכא בדלחחא דאלהך	. . . and be discreet to walk with the fear (worship) of your God?

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Hosea 2:9(7).

<sup>2</sup> ". . . like the Pesh. . . , it [the Targum] avoids the bolder expression 'walk with thy God.'" (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 140).

One more passage shall be noted:

[3] HOSEA 12:1(11:12)<sup>1</sup>

<p>ויהודה ער רר עם- אל</p> <p>7 ודבית יהודה חזו מחפיה בפולחנה</p>	<p>And Judah<sup>sCQ</sup> wanders rest- lessly with God,<sup>2</sup></p> <p>And those of the house of Judah were strong in worship,</p>
---	--

Since the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain, no definite conclusion can be reached concerning the reasons of the targumist for the translation given.

The treatment of these passages shows that here the targumist probably was motivated by an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

#### (10) DEPARTING FROM GOD

In the Twelve there are several passages which describe men as departing from God. Usually, in the Targum, the highly anthropomorphic<sup>3</sup> and offensive language is softened by the insertion of either פולחנה ("worship, service") or דחלה ("worship, fear"):

[1] HOSEA 1:2 L

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 100.

<sup>2</sup>Following Brown, Driver, Briggs, *op. cit.*, p. 923.

<sup>3</sup>The concept of men departing from God is not only anthropomorphic, but also it implies that God is not omnipresent -- an idea which the Targum avoids.



מַעְהָרִי יְהוָה

. . . by forsaking  
[departing from] the  
Lord.מִבְּחַר פִּלְחָנָא  
דִּיהוָה. . . by forsaking  
(departing from) the  
worship of Yahweh

## [2] HOSEA 7:13 L

כִּי־נָדְדוּ מִמֶּנִּי

. . . for they have  
strayed from me!אֲרִי אֵי־חֲרָקוּ  
מִדְּחַלְתִּי. . . because they have  
removed from My fear  
(worship)!

Another verb זָנָה ("to go astray, fornicate") occurs in the Twelve. Whenever the Hebrew states that this departure (going astray, fornication) is from God, the targumist adds פִּלְחָנָא ("worship").

[3] HOSEA 4:12 L<sup>1</sup>

וַיִּזְנוּ מִתַּחַת אֱלֹהֵיהֶם

. . . and they have left  
their God to play the  
harlot.וַמָּעוּ מִבְּחַר פִּלְחָנָא  
דֵּאלֹהֵיהוֹן. . . and they have gone  
astray from the worship  
of their God.

Whenever the going astray or fornication is not stated explicitly to be from God, the targumist does not add פִּלְחָנָא ("worship"). This is especially interesting since several of

---

<sup>1</sup>So also Hosea 9:1 L; cf. Zephaniah 1:6.

these passages are closely allied to the above passage, e.g.:

[4] HOSEA 4:10<sup>1</sup>

הִזְנוּ וְלֹא יִמְרְצוּ  
כִי-אֶת-יְהוָה עֲזָבוּ  
לְשֹׁמֵר

\* \* \* they shall play  
the harlot, but not  
multiply, because they  
have forsaken the Lord  
to cherish harlotry.

יִסְבּוּן נָשִׁין וְלֹא יוֹלְדוּן  
בְּנֵין אֲרִי יָח פִּלְחָנָא  
דִּיהוָה שְׁבָקוּ וְלֹא נִטְרוּ

They will take wives  
(women) but they will not  
beget sons, because they  
have left the worship of  
Yahweh and have not kept  
(guarded) it.

The addition of פִּלְחָנָא ("worship") here is not due to the presence of the verb זָנָה ("to play the harlot") but is added to avoid the concept of leaving (עָזַב) God. Note, however, that the Targum does soften the concept of Israel fornicating, probably because of a pro-Israel bias.

[5] HOSEA 4:15

אִם-זָנָה אַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל

Though you play the  
harlot, O Israel,

אִם טָעָן אֶהְיוֹן דְּבֵית  
יִשְׂרָאֵל

Though you err, O house  
of Israel,

A comparison of the above passages, and their translation in the Targum, shows that the targumist avoided the anthropomorphic and offensive language of the Hebrew by the

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also Hosea 2:7(5); 3:3 [פִּלְחָנָא occurs just before the verb]; 4:18; 5:3 [the Targum uses the verb טָעָן]; 4:13,14 [T. = זָנָה].

insertion of פולחנה ("worship").

# (11) REBELLING AGAINST GOD

The description of man as rebelling against God is strongly anthropomorphic. The targumist, therefore, avoids this concept by the insertion of Memra (מימרא = "word") when the verbs פשע ("to transgress, rebel"), סור ("to rebel"), and מרד ("to rebel") occur:

## [1] HOSEA 7:13 L<sup>1</sup>

כי־פשעו בי	. . . for they have rebelled against me!
ארי מרדו במימרי	. . . for they have rebelled against My Word!

## [2] HOSEA 7:14 L<sup>2</sup>

יסורו בי	. . . they rebel against me.
מרדו במימרי	. . . they rebelled against My Word.

## [3] HOSEA 14:1(13:16)

כי מרתה באלהיה	. . . because she [Samarita] has rebelled against her God;
ארי סליבת על מימרי אלהה	. . . because she has rebelled against the Word of her God;

<sup>1</sup>So also Zephaniah 3:11 L.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 100f.

This verse is interesting because the targumist does not translate מרה ("to rebel") by his usual verb, מרד ("to rebel").

Another passage should be noted because the targumist makes an addition: מרדו<sup>1</sup> במימרי למנא עליהון מלכא . . . they have rebelled against My Word by putting over themselves a king . . .").

The targumist also avoids the concept of men being false (treacherous) toward God or of merely being opposed to Him.

[4] HOSEA 5:7<sup>2</sup>

ביהוה בנדו	They have dealt faith- lessly with the Lord;
במימרא דיהוה שקרו	They have been false to the Word of Yahweh;

[5] HOSEA 6:7<sup>3</sup>

שם בנדו בי	. . . there they dealt faithlessly with me.
[חמן] שקרו במימרי	. . . they lied against My Word.

[6] HOSEA 13:9<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 10:9; cf. Habakkuk 3:6 where the Targum adds, על עם דרא דעברו על מימריה ("over the people of the generation who passed over His Word").

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 103.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see page 103, footnote 3.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 101f.

שחתך ישראל כִּי-  
בִּי בעֶזְרִךְ

It is thy destruction,  
O Israel, That thou art  
against Me, against thy  
help.<sup>1</sup>

כִּד מחבלין אחון  
עובדיכון בֵּית ישראל  
שלטין בכון עממא וכד  
הייבין אחון לאורתי  
מימרי הוה בסעדכון

When you made your deeds  
wicked, O house of Israel,  
the nations ruled over you.  
But whenever you have  
turned to My Law, My Word  
is at your assistance.

Although the correct translation of the Hebrew is uncertain<sup>2</sup>, nevertheless, the targumist obviously has interpreted and softened the meaning of the Hebrew text. Certainly, the prominence of the Law and the spiritual truths stated in the Targum illustrate that fact. The addition of Memra possibly reflects an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

The targumist avoided the anthropomorphic and offensive idea of being, or rebelling, against God. This fact is established by an examination of the above passages as well as by comparison with the literal translations used whenever the rebellion is not directed towards God.

## (12) OTHER ACTIONS AGAINST DEITY

In addition to using the devices of פולחנא ("worship"), דחלתא ("fear, worship"), and מימרא ("Word") the targumist also used קרם ("before") to avoid describing actions of men which were directed against Deity:

<sup>1</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Harper, op. cit., p. 399.

## [1] TO SPEAK AGAINST GOD

## (a) HOSEA 7:13 E

והם דברו עלי כזבים	. . . but they speak lies against me.
ואינון הוו ממליין קדמי כדבין	. . . but they have spoken lies before Me.

## (b) MALACHI 3:13

חזקו עלי דבריכם מה-נדברנו עליך	Your words have been stout against me . . . 'How have we spoken against thee?'
הקיפו קדמי פיתומיכון מה אסנינא למלא קדמך	Your words are powerful before Me . . . 'How have we multiplied speech before you?'

The targumist softens the Hebrew in each of these passages by translating על ("against, unto") as קדם ("before").

## [2] PROVOKING GOD TO ANGER

## ZECHARIAH 8:14

בתקציף אבתיכם אחי	. . . when your fathers provoked me to wrath . .
כד ארניזו אבהתכון קדמי	. . . when your fathers were angry before Me . .

In this passage the targumist translated אס as קדם ("before").

## [3] ROBBING GOD



MALACHI 3:8<sup>1</sup>

הִיָּקַבַּע אֶת־אֱלֹהִים  
בְּמֶה קִבְּעוֹנוֹךְ...

Will a man rob God? . .  
How are we robbing  
thee?

הִירֵנוּ גִבּוֹר קֹדֶם  
דִּיֵּינוּ... בְּמֶה אֲרִיזָנוּ  
קֹדֶם

Is a man angry before the  
Judge? . . . How have we  
been angry before You?

## [4] SURROUNDING GOD WITH LIES

## HOSEA 12:1(1:12)

סָבְבוּ בִכְחַשׁ  
אֶפְרַיִם

Ephraim has encompassed  
me with lies,

אֶת־בֵּיתִי קִדְּמוּ בְּכַדְבוֹתַי  
דְּבַר אֶפְרַיִם

The house of Ephraim has  
multiplied lies before Me,

In the last two passages the Targum adds קֹדֶם ("before").  
In Malachi 3:8 it softens the Hebrew even further by its  
translation of אֱלֹהִים ("God") as דִּיֵּינוּ ("judge").

## [5] RISING UP AS AN ENEMY

## MICAH 2:8

וַאֲחֲמוֹל עָמִי לְאוֹיֵב  
יִקּוּמָם

But yesterday my people  
rose as an enemy;<sup>2</sup>

מִקְבִּיל חֻבִּיהוֹן  
עָמִי לְבַעִיל דְּבָרָא  
מִסִּירִין

Because of the sins of  
my people they have been  
handed over to the enemy.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 104f.

<sup>2</sup>Following the Revised Standard Version, footnote e,  
p. 966.

Here the Hebrew text<sup>1</sup> is corrupt; therefore, no definite conclusion may be reached from the translation of the Targum.

[6] PLANNING (DEVISING) AGAINST GOD

(a) HOSEA 7:15

ואלי יחשבו-רע	. . . yet they devise evil against me.
להשוא קדמי בישן	. . . to plan evil before Me.

(b) NAHUM 1:9

מה-תחשבון אל-יהוה	What do you plot against the Lord?
מה אחון חשיבין קדם יהוה	What do you plan before Yahweh?

(c) NAHUM 1:11

חשב על-יהוה רעה	. . . who plotted evil against the Lord,
דחשיב על עמיה דיהוה	. . . who planned evil against the people of Yahweh. . .

The targumist avoids the concept of plotting evil against the Lord by the translation of אל ("unto, against") as קדם in Hosea 7:15 and in Nahum 1:9. In Nahum 1:11, however, the targumist translates the preposition על literally but avoids the anthropomorphism by the addition of עמיה ד'

<sup>1</sup>E.g., see Smith, Ward, Bower, op. cit., p. 61.

("the people of"). This addition suggests that the targumist also was influenced by a pro-Israel, anti-heathen motive.

### (13) HIDING FROM GOD

The targumist avoids this concept, yet he does not follow a consistent pattern in his translation. He translates Hosea 13:14<sup>1</sup> in such a peculiar manner that it is impossible to be certain just what part of the Aramaic corresponds to a given part of the Hebrew. Moreover, the entire verse contains so many offensive anthropomorphic ideas, especially this last clause, that the reason for the targumist's paraphrase is obscure.

#### [1] AMOS 9:3a<sup>2</sup>

ואם-יהבאו (בראש  
הכרמל)

Though they hide themselves  
(on the top of Carmel),

ואם ידמון לאיממרא  
(בריש מנדלי  
כרכיא)

Though they consider to be  
hidden (at the top of the  
tower of the fortified  
city),  
us

This translation conveys the essential meaning of the Hebrew and yet softens the concept by the addition of ידמון ("they consider").

#### [2] ZEPHANIAH 2:3

אולי תסתרו ביום  
אף-יהוה

... perhaps you may be  
hidden on the day of the  
wrath of the Lord.

<sup>1</sup>See pages 220f.

<sup>2</sup>See pages 217f for Amos 9:3c L.

מַאִים יִחַן עֲלֵינוּ  
בְּיוֹם רוּחַ דִּיחָה

... perhaps there will  
be protection for you in  
the day of the anger of  
Yahweh.

These verses show that the targumist avoids the concept of being hidden from God. In one passage (Hosea 5:3) the Targum is fairly literal. Here the Hebrew text states that Israel is not hid from God -- therefore, no alteration was necessary.

#### (14) FEARING (WORSHIPPING) GOD

The description of men fearing<sup>1</sup> (worshipping) God is retained generally with only slight changes. The targumist usually adds only קִדְם ("before") to soften the anthropomorphism while retaining the spiritual truth. Thus the Targum states that men fear (worship) before God instead of saying directly that men worship (fear) God, e.g.; וַיִּדְחִלוּ<sup>2</sup>

וַיִּרְאוּ קִדְם לָךְ ("and they fear [worship] before You.") for וַיִּרְאוּ<sup>3</sup>  
לָךְ ("... and they shall fear because of thee.").

In this same verse (Micah 7:17) another verb occurs which conveys a more offensive idea -- that of men dreading God. In both passages where this concept is suggested, the

<sup>1</sup>Whenever the Twelve describes man as fearing anyone or anything except Deity, the translation is literal.

<sup>2</sup>Note Targum of Hosea 2:9(7) [see page 201] and 12:1 (11:12) [see page 287] where the idea of worshipping before God has been added.

<sup>3</sup>Micah 7:17e

targumist translates in a way that avoids conveying this idea.

[1] MICAH 7:17d

אל-יהוה אלהינו  
יפחדו

. . . they shall turn in  
dread to the Lord our God,

לפני קדש יהוה  
אלהינו יתברון

. . . before Yahweh our  
God they will be broken,

This translation avoids the offensive anthropomorphic concept. Moreover, it also may reflect an anti-heathen bias.

[2] HOSEA 3:5

ויפחדו אל-יהוה

. . . and they shall come  
in fear to the Lord . . .

ויתנהקו לפולחנהו  
דיהוה

. . . and they shall follow  
eagerly the worship of  
Yahweh . . .

This translation of ויפחדו ("and they will dread") by ויתנהקו ("and they will follow eagerly"), coupled with the addition of פולחנהו ("worship"), softens the offensive idea of dreading God and also is more favorable to Israel. It may reflect then a pro-Israel bias.

(15) SERVING GOD

The description of man as serving God, like that of man fearing Him, is closely associated with the concept of worshipping Deity. Therefore, the targumist selected פלח

<sup>1</sup>" . . . it is observable that at Hosea iii.5 they [Targum and Syriac] do not seem quite at home with this construction," (Taylor, op. cit., p. 187).

("to serve, worship") as a translation of the Hebrew verb עֲבַד ("to serve"). In addition, he used קִדְם ("before") in Zephaniah 3:9 and in Malachi 3:14,18 (twice).

MALACHI 3:14<sup>1</sup>

שׁוּא עֲבַד אֱלֹהִים	It is vain to serve God.
לֹא לַחֲנוּאָה מִן דַּפְלָח	There is no <sup>advantage</sup> joy to one
קִדְם יְהוָה	who worships before Yahweh.

The targumist uses only the verb פִּלַּח ("to serve, worship") in Malachi 3:17 (see page 192, footnote 1) as a translation of עֲבַד ("to serve").

## (16) RETURNING TO GOD

Usually the targumist avoided the anthropomorphic concept of returning to God by adding פִּוִּלְחָנָא ("worship"), for example:

1 JOEL 2:12 L<sup>2</sup>

שׁוּבוּ עָדַי	. . . return to me . . .
חֲזְרוּ לַפִּוִּלְחָנִי	. . . return to My worship . . .

<sup>1</sup>See also Zephaniah 3:9 and Malachi 3:17,18. The targumist uses only the verb פִּלַּח ("to serve, worship") in Malachi 3:17 (see page 192, footnote 1) as a translation of עֲבַד ("to serve").

<sup>2</sup>The same procedure is followed in Hosea 3:5; 5:4; 6:1; 7:10; 14:3(2); Joel 2:13 L; Amos 4:6 L,8,9 L, 10 L,11; Zechariah 1:3; Malachi 3:7; cf. Haggai 2:17 L. In Malachi 3:7 the targumist translates the second שׁוּבוּ literally but adds מִיִּמְרָא. In Malachi 3:18 the targumist translates literally without any additions.



In one passage, however, the synonymous term **רחלחא** ("fear, worship") occurs.

[2] HOSEA 14:2(1)

שובה ישראל עד יהוה אלהיך	Return, O Israel, to the Lord your God,
חוב ישראל דיהוה אלהך לדחלחא	Return, O Israel, to the fear (worship) of Yahweh your God,

In all of these passages the Targum uses **חוב** ("return"), the Aramaic verb corresponding to the Hebrew **שוב** ("to return"). In one passage, however, another verb occurs.

[3] HOSEA 12:7(6)

ואתה באלהיך חשוב	So you, by the help of your God, return,
ואתה בפולחנא דאלהך חתקף	So you be strong in the worship of your God,

These translations prove that the targumist considered it necessary to safeguard his conception of Deity from the anthropomorphic and non-omnipresent implications of the Hebrew text.

(17) BELIEVING, ETC., IN GOD

The concepts of believing ( **אמן** or **בפח** ), rejoicing ( **שמח**, **עלו**, or **גיל** ), and being strong ( **נבר** or **אמן** ) in God were objectionable to the targumist who may have considered them to be highly anthropomorphic. He avoids these concepts

by introducing the intermediary agency of the Memra or Word  
(מימרא) of God.

[1] JONAH 3:5

ויאמינו אנשי נינוה באלהים	And the people of Ninevah believed [in] God;
והימיני אינשי נינוה במימרא דיהוה	And the men of Ninevah believed in the Word of Yahweh;

[2] ZEPHANIAH 3:2

ביהוה לא בטחה	She does not trust in the Lord,
במימרא דיהוה לא איתרחצה	She does not believe in the Word of Yahweh.

[3] JOEL 2:23

גילו ושמחו ביהוה אלהיכם	Be glad . . . and rejoice in the Lord, your God;
בועו וחדו במימרא דיהוה אלהכון	Rejoice and be glad in the Word of Yahweh your God.

[4] HABAKKUK 3:18

ואני ביהוה אעלוזה	Yet I will rejoice in the Lord,
ואנא במימרא דיהוה איבוע	I will rejoice in the Word of Yahweh;

[5] ZECHARIAH 10:7<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The same translation occurs also in Joel 2:23 (see above), but in Habakkuk 3:18 the Targum translates אנילה ("I will joy . . .") as אדון ("I will exult . . .") -- a different verb.

יגל לבם ביהוה	... their hearts shall exult in the Lord.
יבוע לבהון במימרא דיהוה	... their hearts shall rejoice in the Word of Yahweh.

## [6] ZECHARIAH 10:12

וגברתים ביהוה	I will make them strong in the Lord . . .
ואינברינון במימרא דיהוה	And I will make them strong in the Word of Yahweh . . .

## [7] ZECHARIAH 12:5

אמצה לי ישבי ירושלם ביהוה צבאות אלהיהם	The inhabitants of Jerusalem have strength through the Lord of hosts, their God.
אישתכח פורקן ליחבי ירושלם במימרא דיהוה צבאות אלההון	Salvation has been found for the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the Word of Yahweh of Hosts, their God. <sup>1</sup>

These translations clearly demonstrate that the targumist has avoided these anthropomorphic concepts.

## (18) REMEMBERING AND FORGETTING GOD

The related concepts of remembering and forgetting God occur a few times in the Twelve. In each instance the targumist avoids the offensive idea by interpreting it spiritually. He usually adds מולחנא ("worship"), but in

<sup>1</sup>Following Wright (C.H.H.), op. cit., p. 585 .

one instance he adds דלחחא ("fear, worship").

[1] HOSEA 8:14 L<sup>1</sup>

וישכח ישראל את-  
עשהו

For Israel has for-  
gotten his Maker,

ושבק ישראל ית  
פולחן עבדיה

For Israel has for-  
saken the worship of  
his Maker,

[2] ZECHARIAH 10:9

ובמרחקים יזכרוני

. . . yet in far  
countries they will  
remember me,

ובארע רחיקא הוו  
דכירין לרחלתי

. . . yet in a distant  
land they have remembered  
My fear,

— — — — —

The pattern of consistent avoidance of the concept of forgetting God, whenever it is stated explicitly or is implied, by saying that man will remember God proves that the targumist deliberately avoided this offensive concept.

(19) HATING GOD

The description of Israel as hating God occurs only once in the Twelve, and here it is avoided by the addition of פולחנא ("worship"):

ZECHARIAH 11:8

---

<sup>1</sup>The same paraphrase occurs also in Jonah 2:8 L (where the verb שכח, "to remember", occurs) and in Hosea 2:15(13) and 13:6 (where the same verb שכח, "to forget", occurs).

ונט-נפשם<sup>1</sup> בחלה בי

. . . and they also  
detested me.

על דנפשחהון קצח  
בפולחני

. . . because their soul  
hated (rejected) My  
worship.

---

An examination of nineteen groups of actions, attitudes, etc., of men toward God, which imply that God is anthropomorphic, indicates that the Targum generally avoids the use of anthropomorphic expressions.

X                      X                      X                      X                      X

The conclusion may be reached from this study that the Targum usually avoids these "lesser anthropomorphic" expressions but even more consistently avoids use of the "grosser anthropomorphisms".

---

<sup>1</sup>The Targum "explains" as קצח בפולחני (so Jansma, op. cit., p. 101).

## CHAPTER VIII

### FURTHER ALTERATIONS CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF GOD IN THE TARGUM

In the preceding two chapters, the effect of the targumist's concept of Deity and his attitude toward the grosser and lesser anthropomorphisms has been discussed. In this chapter the effect of his concept of Deity as omnipresent, omniscient, unchangeable, etc., will be considered. In a few passages already mentioned or discussed the effect of certain of these concepts has been noted. Many of the passages considered here are anthropomorphic.

#### 1. THE OMNIPRESENCE OF DEITY

The description of Deity as being in a particular place, or as moving about, would be offensive to those who believe that God is omnipresent. Consequently, if the targumist conceived of Deity as omnipresent, in his translations of passages which localize God to a particular place, or which describe Him as being in motion, alterations might be expected.

##### (1) THE DENIAL OF PLACE TO DEITY

The targumist usually avoided the description of Deity as being in a certain place by the addition of the Shekinah.



[1] JOEL 4(3):17 L<sup>1</sup>

שכן בציון

... who [God] dwells  
in Zion;אשריחי שכינתי  
בציוןI cause My Shekinah to  
dwell in Zion.

The verb שכן ("to dwell") may have suggested the use of the intermediary device of the Shekinah to the targumist. Each passage<sup>2</sup> in the Twelve in which God is described as dwelling (שכן) in a certain place is translated in the same manner (as here) in the Targum.

In one passage God is said to encamp. The Targum alters this statement following the established pattern:

## [2] ZECHARIAH 9:8

וחניתי לבייתי  
מצבהThen I will encamp at  
my house as a guard,ואשרי בניתי<sup>3</sup>  
מקדשי שכינתי  
יקריAnd I will cause the  
Shekinah of My Glory  
to dwell in the house  
of My Sanctuary,

The additions of יקרי ("My Glory") and מקדשי ("My Sanctuary") probably arise from the targumist's interpretation of לבייתי ("at my house") as referring to the temple.

<sup>1</sup>Ginsburger, (*op. cit.*, p. 434) incorrectly reads Jon. 4:17, 21 for Joel 4:17, 21.

<sup>2</sup>The verb שכן occurs also in Joel 4(3):21 L; Zechariah 2:14(10) L, 15(11); and 8:3. In each instance the Targum translates correspondingly, adding the Shekinah.

<sup>3</sup>A "standard translation" (Jansma, *op. cit.*, p. 68).

## [3] ZECHARIAH 9:1 L

In this verse Damascus is described as being God's resting place<sup>1</sup>. This idea would be offensive not only because it seems to localize God to a given place but also because Damascus, a heathen city, was conceived as being the location of God's dwelling (or perhaps a temple devoted to God). Hence, the Targum softens this clause somewhat:

ודמשק מנוחהו

And in Damascus shall be  
His resting-place;<sup>2</sup>

ודמשק חתוב<sup>3</sup>  
למיהויה מארע ביה  
שכינתיה

And Damascus returns to  
be a part of the land of  
the House of His Shekinah.<sup>4</sup>

Here the targumist has added ביה ("house") and ארע ("land") as well as Shekinah to avoid limiting Deity to a given place. In Hosea 2:25(23) and 9:3 mention is made of God's land. In the former, the Targum softens it to "the land of the house of My Shekinah," and in the latter to "the land of My Shekinah".

<sup>1</sup>The Hebrew is somewhat ambiguous, and either the Word of God or the Lord may be considered as resting in Damascus. See, e.g., Mitchell, Smith, Bower, *op. cit.*, p. 262. The Targum, however, apparently considered that Yahweh had a resting-place in Damascus.

<sup>2</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>3</sup>Churgin, (*op. cit.*, p. 110) compares this translation with Sifre Deut. 116 and Com. Cant. r. צוארך.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Cohen (*op. cit.*, p. 303) who states, "Both Hadrach and Damascus will become part of the new Kingdom and God's Presence will abide there." Perhaps the Targum, as well as Cohen and the Yalkut, considered that the Hebrew meant, ". . . Jerusalem will in the future be reaching as far as Damascus . . . and this expression 'His rest' means nothing else than Jerusalem," (King, *op. cit.*, pp. 47f).

## [4] AMOS 9:6

חֲבוּנָה בַּשָּׁמַיִם  
מַעְלוֹתָיו וְאֹנֵתוֹ  
עַל-אֶרֶץ יִסְדָּהּ

. . . who builds his  
upper chambers in the  
heavens, and founds his  
vault upon the earth;

דָּאֲשֶׁרִי בַחֲקוֹף רוּמָא  
שְׁכִינָתָהּ יִקְרִיָּהּ וְכֹנִישָׁתָהּ  
עַל אֶרֶעָא קִשְׁתָּהּ

. . . who has placed the  
Shekinah of His Glory in  
a strong place and  
honored His assembly  
upon the earth.

The addition of יִקְרִיָּהּ שְׁכִינָתָהּ ("the Shekinah of His Glory") avoids describing God as being localized to certain chambers -- even in heaven.

This same pattern of procedure is followed in those passages where God is said to be in the midst of (קִרְבִּי, חֵיךְ) people or of a place.

[5] JOEL<sup>1</sup> 2:27 L<sup>2</sup>

כִּי בִקְרִבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל  
אֲנִי

. . . that I am in the  
midst of Israel,

אֲרִי בְנוֹ בֵּית  
יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר־יְהִי  
שְׁכִינָתִי

. . . that I cause my  
Shekinah to dwell in  
the house of Israel,

[6] ZECHARIAH 2:9(5) L<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ginsburger (*op. cit.*, p. 434) incorrectly reads Jon. for Joel.

<sup>2</sup>The same translation for the corresponding Hebrew occurs also in Zephaniah 3:5 L (see page 327), 15 L, and 17 L, where קִרְבִּי also occurs.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. also Zechariah 2:14(10) L, 15(11); and 8:3, where the preposition חֵיךְ also occurs, and the Targum renders the same Hebrew idea in the same way. See page 306, footnote 2.

ולכבוד אהיה בתוכה

. . . and I will be the  
glory within her.

וביקר אשרי שכונתי  
בנוה

. . . and with honor I  
will cause My Shekinah  
to dwell with her.

In two passages, however, the targumist avoids this  
idea in a slightly different manner:

[7] HOSEA 11:9 L<sup>1</sup>

בקרוב קדוש

. . . the Holy One in  
your midst,

כין גוריה ביניכון  
שכונתי קדישא

Then I will covenant with  
you My Holy Shekinah,

[8] MICAH 3:11 L<sup>2</sup>

הלא יהוה בקרבנו

Is not the Lord in the  
midst of us?

הלא שכונתא דיהוה  
בינוה

Is not the Shekinah of  
Yahweh with us?

In several passages God is described as having His  
own place (מקום), temple (היכל), and habitation (מנוח).

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also Amos 5:17 L, where not only place but motion  
with respect to God is involved. This verse is discussed in  
the next section. See pages 318f.

<sup>2</sup>A similar idea of the limitation of Deity to a given  
place may be observed in the query in Micah 7:10 (see page  
264) and Joel 2:17. The latter reads, איה אלהיהם ("Where  
is their God?"). The targumist translates this by אן דאיתפריקו  
במיתר אלההון ("Where are those who are redeemed by the Word  
of their God?"). In Malachi 2:17, however, the targumist  
translates איה אלהי המשפט ("Or by asking, 'Where is the  
God of justice?'" accurately as איה אלהי דעביד דינא  
("Or, where is the God who makes justice?").

<sup>3</sup>For Zechariah 2:17(13), see pages 322f.

The targumist surprisingly is not consistent in his treatment of these terms.

[9] HOSEA 5:15

אלך אשובה אל-מקומי

I will return again unto my place,

אסליק שכינתי אחוב  
למדור קדשי

I will cause My Shekinah to ascend; I will return Him? to My Holy Dwelling.

The verbs of motion involved in this passage, and in the following one, complicate the problem.

[10] MICAH 1:3 L<sup>1</sup>

כי-הנה יהוה יצא  
ממקומו

For behold, the Lord is coming forth out of his place,

ארי הא יהוה<sup>2</sup> מיהול  
מאחר בית שכינתיה

For behold, Yahweh is revealed from the city of the house of His Shekinah,

In four places, in the Twelve, reference is made to God's Temple. In three<sup>3</sup> passages the idea is translated literally, but in Habakkuk 2:20 the concept is altered.

[11] HABAKKUK 2:20 L

---

<sup>1</sup>The same translation occurs in Habakkuk 3:13 and Zechariah 14:3 for <sup>אצ</sup> ("to go forth"); in Hosea 6:3 the translation of <sup>מוצא</sup> ("going forth") is literal.

<sup>2</sup>"The coming forth is rightly interpreted as a self-revelation." (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 5).

<sup>3</sup>Jonah 2:8(7); Micah 1:2; and Malachi 3:1.

וַיְהוֹה בְּחֵיכַל קֹדֶשׁ

But the Lord is in his  
holy temple;

וַיְהוֹה אֵיחָרְעִי לְאַשְׂרָא  
שְׁכִינָתָהּ בְּחֵיכַל  
דְּקוּשָׁיָהּ

But Yahweh wished to  
place the Shekinah in  
the temple of His  
holiness.

The targumist also avoids depicting God as having upper chambers or a vault in Amos 9:6<sup>1</sup>. In Micah 4:2, moreover, the Targum adds the Shekinah to "the house of the God of Jacob." The targumist may have thought that the context here suggested that God was localized to Jerusalem, and, thus, he avoided this statement by the addition of the Shekinah. Similarly, the Targum avoided the idea that God is "on high" by the use of the Shekinah:

[12] MICAH 6:6

אֶכְפֹּף לְאֱלֹהֵי מְרוֹם

. . . and bow myself  
before God on high?

אִישְׁתַּעֲבֹד לְאֱלֹהָ  
דְּשְׁכִינָתָהּ בְּשָׁמַי  
מְרוֹמָא

Shall I submit myself to  
the God whose Shekinah  
is in the high heavens?

Certain verbs<sup>2</sup>, which imply that Deity may be found in certain places, are avoided by the Targum in a few instances. The verb, שָׁב (to sit), for instance, is translated by גִּלִּי ("to reveal"), a standard translation of a verb of motion. Similarly, the verb עָמַד ("to stand") is translated by גִּלִּי

<sup>1</sup>See page 308.

<sup>2</sup>For the verb שָׁב ("to dwell") see page 306.

<sup>3</sup>Joel 4(3):12 L; Malachi 3:3.

<sup>4</sup>Habakkuk 3:6; Zechariah 14:4 (see page 225).



("to reveal"), but the cognate verb נצב ("to stand") is translated literally once<sup>1</sup> and by עלק ("to ascend"), a verb of motion, once.

Two other verbs, חלץ ("to withdraw") and שור ("to depart"), must be considered. These verbs, strictly speaking, are verbs of motion, but in the context they imply that God is confined in space as well as that He moves about. Hence, the targumist follows the usual procedure in translating these verbs:

[13] HOSEA 5:6 L

חלץ מהם

. . . he has withdrawn from them.

ימליק שכינתיה  
מינהון

. . . His Shekinah has ascended from them.

[14] HOSEA 9:12 L

בשורי מהם

. . . when I depart from them!

במלקוטי שכינתי  
מינהון

. . . when My Shekinah departs from them!

Two more groups of passages should be discussed here. The first group consists of about nine passages in which the targumist inserts Shekinah, and yet the motive for the insertion is not clear. For example, in Haggai 1:8 God tells the people to rebuild the temple, and then He adds:

---

<sup>1</sup>Amos 7:7.

<sup>2</sup>Amos 9:1.

וארצה-בו ואכבד

. . . and I will take  
pleasure in it, and I  
will be glorified,<sup>1</sup>

The targumist translates this passage as if he thought that the Hebrew limited Deity to a certain locality, namely as:

ואיחרעי לאשראה  
שכינתי ביה  
ביקר

. . . and I will choose (be  
pleased) to place My  
Shekinah in it with glory.

Perhaps the targumist considered that the only way God could take pleasure in the rebuilt temple and be glorified was for Him to dwell in it. Therefore, he used his usual method of avoiding any implication that God is not omnipresent.

Likewise, when God is said to have chosen Jerusalem, the translator may have considered that this implied that He would dwell there. Therefore, he follows his usual mode of rendering:

[15] ZECHARIAH 3:2

וינער יחזה בך  
הבחר בירושלם

The Lord who has chosen  
Jerusalem rebukes you!

וינער יחזה בך  
דאיחרעי לאשראה  
שכינתיה בירושלם

Yahweh who chose (was  
pleased) to place His  
Shekinah in Jerusalem  
rebukes you!

In Hosea 13:14<sup>2</sup> and Habakkuk 3:4 statements occur which

<sup>1</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>2</sup>See page 220; see also Amos 9:3 L and Zephaniah 2:3 (see pages 296f). Cf. Hosea 5:3.

the targumist seemingly considered to have been opposed to the idea that God is omnipresent and omniscient:

[16] HABAKKUK 3:4

וְשֵׁם הַבְּיוֹן עֲזָה

. . . and there he veiled his power.

חֲסִין נִלִּי יְהוָה  
שְׁכִינָתוֹ דְּהוּוּת  
מִסְמָרָא מְבִנִי אִינוּשָׁא  
בְּחֻקֵּי רֹמָא

There He revealed His Shekinah which had been hidden from the sons of men with great power.

The targumist may have considered that Micah 3:4<sup>1</sup> implied that God was not omnipresent, and, therefore, he made use of the intermediary, the Shekinah.

The targumist who interpreted the second chapter of Hosea allegorically may have considered the clause מִן-אֲפִשְׁטָנָה (". . . lest I strip her naked. . .)"<sup>2</sup> to mean that God would leave Israel alone completely and, therefore, that He was not omnipresent. Hence, he translated:

דִּילְמָא אִימְלִק  
שְׁכִינָתִי מִיָּנָה

. . . lest I should remove My Shekinah from her<sup>3</sup>. . .

The remaining three verses are much more difficult to understand. One verse (Zechariah 9:1<sup>4</sup>) has been discussed earlier in this chapter. The remaining two are:

<sup>1</sup>See page 234.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 2:5(3).

<sup>3</sup>This translation is somewhat less unfavorable to Israel.

<sup>4</sup>See page 307.

## [17] HABAKKUK 3:8

מרכבתך ישועה	... upon thy chariot of victory?
שכינתך לעמך חקוק ופורקן	Your Shekinah was strength and redemption to your people.

## [18] ZEPHANIAH 3:7

ולא-יכרת מעונה	... and her dwelling will not be cut off . . . <sup>1</sup>
לא יפסוק מדורחון מארע ביה שכינתי	... and the house of My Shekinah will not destroy their habitations from the earth. . .

The final group of translations, which protects the targumist's belief in the omnipresence of Deity by avoiding the limitation of Deity to space, consists of statements that God is with someone, e.g., Israel:

## [19] AMOS 5:14 E

ויהי-כן יהוה אלהי- צבאות אחכם	... and so the Lord, the God of hosts, will be with you,
ויהי כען מימרא דיהוה אלהי צבאות בסעדכון	... and now the Word of Yahweh, the God of Hosts, will be at your assistance.

## [20] HAGGAI 1:13 E

<sup>1</sup>According to footnote h, p. 981, Revised Standard Version.

<sup>2</sup>Essentially this same translation occurs in Zechariah 8:23 E, where the preposition על occurs instead of את.

אני אחכם	I am with you,
מימרי בסעדכון <sup>1</sup>	My word is at your assistance,

This latter expression of the targumist also occurs in his translation of three passages<sup>2</sup>, which involve the close connection of God and Israel, and is added in a fourth:

[21] HOSEA 1:9 E

ואנכי לא-אחיה לכם	. . . and I am not your God. <sup>3</sup>
ומימרי לא הוי בסעדכון	. . . and My Word will not be at your assistance.

[22] MICAH 2:13 E

ויחיה בראשם	. . . the Lord at their head.
ומימרא דיהוה בסעדכון	. . . and the Word of Yahweh (is) at your assistance.

[23] HOSEA 11:11

Here the Targum adds to the statement that God will restore the Israelites to their homes,

<sup>1</sup>Essentially this same translation occurs in Haggai 2:4 E with the preposition **אח** and in Zechariah 10:5 E (see Hamp, Der Begriff "Wort" in den aramäischen Bibelübersetzungen [München: Filser-Verlag, 1938], p. 50) with the preposition **עם**.

<sup>2</sup>One of these (Hosea 13:9) has already been considered; see pages 291f. Probably, in this instance, the **בְּעִזְרִי** (against thy help,) suggested the **בסעדכון הוה מימרי** ("My Word will be at your assistance,").

<sup>3</sup>So the Revised Standard Version: their footnote a, page 936 reads, "Heb I will not be yours".

וּמִיָּמֵי  
בְּמַעֲרָהוֹן

. . . and My Word will  
be at their assistance  
. . .

Although the Targum does not avoid consistently limiting Deity in space<sup>1</sup>, the translations of the above passages clearly establish that the targumist does seek to safeguard his concept of an omnipresent Deity.

## (2) THE DENIAL OF MOTION TO DEITY

Since the description of Deity as being in motion implies not only that God is not omnipresent but also that God has a visible form, the usual device that the targumist employs to soften this concept of Deity is to use the verb, גַּל ("to reveal"), for example:

### [1] HOSEA 10:12<sup>2</sup> (גַּל)

עַד-גַּל

. . . that he may come  
. . .

כַּעַן יִתְגַּל

Now He is revealed . . .

The only two exceptions to the translation of גַּל ("to come") as גַּל ("to reveal") occur in Malachi 3:1<sup>3</sup> and Hosea 6:3. The latter is translated as follows:

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Amos 1:2 L; see page 228, footnote 1.

<sup>2</sup>This same procedure is followed for גַּל ("to come") in Habakkuk 3:3; Zechariah 2:14(10); 14:5; and Malachi 4:5 (3:24).

<sup>3</sup>Translated essentially literally here as יִתְגַּל.



וַיָּבֹא כַּשֵּׁם לָנוּ

. . . he will come to  
us as the showers,

וַיֵּחִי בִּירְכֵן לָנוּ

. . . and blessings will  
come to us. . .[2] MICAH 1:3b L<sup>1</sup> ( יֵרֵד )

וַיֵּרֵד

. . . and [the Lord] will  
come down . . .

וַיִּתְּנֵלִי

. . . and will be revealed  
. . .

## [3] MALACHI 3:5 ( קֵרַב )

וְקֵרַבְתִּי אֵלֵיכֶם  
לְמִשְׁפָּטThen I will draw near to  
you for judgment;וְאִתְּנֵלִי עֲלֵיכֶם  
לְמַעַבְדֵי דִינָאThen I will be revealed  
unto you to make a  
decision;

## [4] HABAKKUK 3:12 ( צִעַר )

בְּזַעַם חֲצֵעַד-אָרֶץ

Thou didst bestride the  
earth in fury,בְּאַחֲיוֹתָךְ לֹוֹם עַל  
סוֹאֵי עַמְּךָ בְּאִתְּנֵלִי וְחָתָךְ  
לְמַחְבֵּר רְשָׁעֵי אֶרֶץWhen you bring a curse  
over those who hate your  
people, when you are  
revealed to break the  
wicked ones of the earth  
. . .[5] AMOS 5:17 L<sup>2</sup> ( עָבַר )

<sup>1</sup>For Micah 1:3a L ( צָא ) see page 310, footnotes 1 and 2.

<sup>2</sup>Elsewhere this verb is translated literally once (Micah 7:18), twice (Amos 7:8; 8:2) by עָבַר ("to send away"), and once (Hosea 10:11) the passage in which it occurs is interpreted allegorically. Therefore, nothing definite can be concluded regarding this verb, עָבַר ("to pass through").

כִּי־אֵעֱבֹר בְּקִרְבְּךָ

. . . for I will pass  
through the midst of  
you,

אֲרִי אֵיחָנְלִי  
לְמַעַבְדּוֹ פּוֹרְעֵנוֹת  
דִּין בְּנוֹיךָ

. . . because the making  
of this punishment in your  
midst is revealed,

The verb הֵלֵךְ ("to go") occurs but twice. Once<sup>1</sup> it is translated essentially literally, but in Hosea 5:15 it occurs in close connection with the verb שׁוּב ("to return"). This passage, however, already has been discussed<sup>2</sup>. In two other passages the description of God as returning is associated closely with the conception that He repents. The targumist avoids this offensive concept by making man, not God, do the turning (or repenting).

[6] JONAH 3:9<sup>3</sup> (שׁוּב)

מִי־יֹדֵעַ יֵשׁוּב וְנָחַם  
הָאֱלֹהִים וְשָׁב מִחֲרוֹן  
אַפּוֹ

Who knows, God may yet  
repent and turn from his  
fierce anger,

מִן יָדַע רָאִיתָ בִּידֶיךָ  
הוֹבִיִן יָחֹב מִיָּנֹחַן  
וַיִּחְרָחֵם עֲלֵנָּא מִן קֳדָם  
יְהוָה וַיִּחְבֹּב מִחֲקוֹף  
רוּחוֹ

Whosoever is conscious of  
guilt, let him turn away  
therefrom and he will  
receive God's compassion<sup>4</sup>  
and He will turn from His  
strong rage.

In three passages the targumist avoids this concept

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 5:14.

<sup>2</sup>See page 310.

<sup>3</sup>Also Joel 2:14 (see pages 249f.).

<sup>4</sup>According to Kalish, *op. cit.*, p. 261. Perhaps the text of the Targum which he used read עֲלֵיךָ ("unto him") instead of עֲלֵנָּא ("unto us"). Cf. W. Wright, *The Book of Jonah* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1857), p. 3.

of Deity by the addition of Memra.

[7] HOSEA 2:11(9) (שוב)

לכן אשוב ולקחתי

Therefore I will take  
back . . .

יבכין יחוב מימרי  
למסל

Then My Word will return  
to take back . . .

In the remaining occurrences the Targum translates literally<sup>2</sup>. This group of literal translations includes the concept of God restoring Israel from captivity<sup>3</sup>.

The verbs קום<sup>4</sup> ("to arise"), עור<sup>5</sup> ("arouse"), סור<sup>6</sup> (hiphil, "remove"), and רכב<sup>7</sup> ("to ride") are translated by גלי when Deity is the subject, e.g.:

[8] ZEPHANIAH 3:11 (סור)

כי-אז אסיר מקרבך  
עליזי גאותך

. . . for then I will  
remove from your midst  
your proudly exalting ones  
. . .

<sup>1</sup>So also Micah 7:19 L essentially; cf. Hosea 11:9 E. In two passages (Zechariah 1:3 and Malachi 3:7) God looks (פני) by the agency of His Memra. In Hosea 5:15 (page 310) the targumist uses an intermediary, the Shekinah.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Nahum 2:3(2); Zechariah 1:16; and 8:3.

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 6:11; Joel 4(3):1; Amos 9:14; Zephaniah 2:7; and 3:20.

<sup>4</sup>Zephaniah 3:8; in Amos 7:9 the verb is translated literally.

<sup>5</sup>Zechariah 2:17(13); see pages 322f.

<sup>6</sup>Zephaniah 3:11,15.

<sup>7</sup>Habakkuk 3:8.

בנין אינלי מנויך  
תקיפי חושבתהיך

Then I will reveal among  
you your praiseworthy  
warriors. . .

Usually ירר (hiphil, "to bring down") is translated literally, but in two instances (Amos 8:9<sup>1</sup>; 9:2) the targumist alters.

[9] AMOS 9:2 (ירר)

משם אורידם

. . . from there I will  
bring them down.

מתמן במימרי<sup>2</sup>  
יחוננון

. . . from there by My  
Word they will be  
brought down.

At times the targumist also avoids the anthropomorphic action of God by the use of the impersonal third person plural and the addition of Memra. The idea of God "bringing down" also occurs in one other passage:

[10] JOEL 4(3):11 (נחה)

הנחה יהוה נבוריך

Bring down thy warriors,  
O Lord.

תמן יהבר יהוה  
תקוף גיבריהון

Then Yahweh will break  
the strength of their  
warriors.

This rendering avoids the description of Deity in motion and also avoids the offensive idea of God having

<sup>1</sup>In Amos 8:9 the context probably caused the change in translation. Here the verb כסי ("to cover") occurs.

<sup>2</sup>So also Obadiah 4.

heavenly warriors.

Two other verbs, usually translated literally, should be noted. Each verb, עלה (hiphil = "to bring up") and לקח ("to take"), occurs in a passage which undergoes some alteration in the Targum.

[11] HOSEA 12:14(13) (עלה)

ובנביא העלה יהוה  
אח-ישראל ממצרים

By a prophet the Lord  
brought Israel up from  
Egypt,

ואף כד נחתו  
אבהחכון למצרים  
נביא שלה יהוה  
ואסיק יה ישראל  
ממצרים

Moreover when your  
fathers descended to  
Egypt, Yahweh sent a  
prophet and he caused  
Israel to ascend from  
Egypt.

The action of bringing Israel from Egypt has shifted more to the prophet than in our Masoretic Text.

[12] HAGGAI 2:23<sup>1</sup> (לקח)

אקחך זרובבל

I will take you, O  
Zerubbabel . . .

איקרבינך זרובבל

I will summon you, O  
Zerubbabel . . .

[13] ZECHARIAH 2:17(13) (עיר)

חס כל-בשר מפני  
יהוה כי נעור  
ממעון קדשו

Be silent, all flesh,  
before the Lord; for he  
has roused himself from  
his holy dwelling.

<sup>1</sup>See Hosea 2:11(9), page 320.

כמו כל רשעיה מן  
קדם יהוה ארי איתגלי  
ממדור קודשיה

- Let all the wicked perish  
before Yahweh because He  
is revealed from His holy  
dwelling place.<sup>1</sup>

[14] ZECHARIAH 2:13(9) L (נוף)

כי הנני מניף  
(את-ידי עליהם)

Behold, I will shake (my  
hand over them,)

ארי הא אנה מרים  
(יה מחת גבורתי  
עליהון)

For, behold I am raising  
(my Powerful Stroke [blow]  
against them,). . .

The examination of the above passage establishes that the targumist sought to safeguard his conception of Deity as omnipresent, usually, by avoiding the use of verbs which describe Deity as in motion.

## 2. THE UNCHANGEABLENESS OF GOD

The suggestion that God was changeable<sup>2</sup> and capricious was very offensive. Hence this concept was avoided in the Targum. This strong feeling probably accounts for the translations concerning God's repenting (נחם<sup>3</sup> and שוב<sup>4</sup>). The thought of God repenting implies that He changes His mind.

<sup>1</sup>Probably the verb of motion accounts for this translation rather than the limitation to a given locality.

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps the Targum understood האמור in Micah 2:7 to mean, "Do I change?". The Targum renders this clause as הכרינן כשר ראמרין ("Is not what I said really correct?").

<sup>3</sup>See page 248.

<sup>4</sup>See Joel 2:14 (see pages 249f); Jonah 3:9 (see pages 319f).



This concept of Deity was intolerable!

### 3. THE OMNISCIENCE OF GOD

Another derogatory implication was that God was not omniscient. Especially the statement, made by God Himself that there was something that He did not know, would be offensive:

#### [1] HOSEA 8:4<sup>1</sup>

ולא ידעתי

. . . but without my knowledge.

ולא כרעותי

. . . but not by My Will.

The statements that God could forget also implies that He was not omniscient, and, consequently, such assertions were altered:

#### [2] HOSEA 4:6

אשכח בנִיךָ

I also will forget your children.

ארחיק בָּנוֹךְ

I will drive out your sons.

#### [3] AMOS 8:7

אם-אשכח לנצח  
כל-מעשיהם

Surely I will never forget any of their deeds.

אם יחשון לעלמין  
כל עובדיהון

Surely all your works will be forgotten.

The translation in Hosea 4:6 is anthropomorphic, but

---

<sup>1</sup>This is the only instance in the Twelve where God is said not to know something.

it avoids the implication that God could ever forget anyone (or anything) -- i.e., that He is not omniscient. In Amos 8:7, however, both the anthropomorphism and the offensive implication that God was not omniscient were avoided.

In Jonah 1:6 and Hosea 7:2 statements occur which imply that God could be forgetful. Therefore, these statements were avoided by the targumist:

[4] JONAH 1:6

אולי יתעשה האלהים

Perhaps the god will  
give a thought to us,

מאיים ירחם מן קדם  
יהוה עלנא

Perhaps compassion may  
be shown from Yahweh  
unto us,

[5] HOSEA 7:2 L<sup>1</sup>

כל-רעתם זכרתי

. . . that I remember all  
their evil works.

דכל בישתהון  
נליין קדמי

. . . that all their evil  
deeds are revealed before  
Me.

The passages which depict anyone as being hidden from

---

<sup>1</sup>In Hosea 8:13 and 9:9 the Masoretic Text states that God will remember (זכר) Israel's iniquity (עוונם). The context in both instances suggests that God's remembrance is for the purpose of punishment. Hence, the Targum states that God will exact (סער) the penalty of their sins (חוביהון). In Habakkuk 3:2, on the other hand, the Targum translates the plea for God, in wrath, to remember compassion (ברנו רחם) as (חזכור) ברחמין הדכר ("but the just who do your Will, You remember with pity."). This last translation retains the idea of God as remembering even though the other three passages in the Targum avoid this concept.

God not only are anthropomorphic, but they imply a lack of knowledge on the part of Deity. The targumist alters these passages<sup>1</sup> in his translation:

[6] AMOS 9:3

ואם יחבאו... ואם-  
יסתרו מנוד עיני  
בקרע הים

Though they hide them-  
selves . . . and though  
they hide from my sight  
at the bottom of the sea,

ואם ידמון לאיטמרא  
ואם יסמרון בונים  
ימא מן קדם מימרי

And if they think to hide  
. . . and if they hide in  
the islands of the sea  
from My Word,

Although the Targum translates the one remaining passage<sup>2</sup> literally, yet the eight passages considered demonstrate that the Targum attempted to avoid the implication that God was not omniscient.

4. THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE TARGUMIST'S CONCEPT  
OF THE CHARACTER OF DEITY

In conclusion, there are several passages in which the desire of the targumist to safeguard his concept of Deity has motivated the changes in his translation.

(1) ZEPHANIAH 1:18<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>For Hosea 13:14 see page 220, for Micah 3:4 see page 234, and for Zephaniah 2:3 see page 296f.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 5:3.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Zechariah 2:17(13); see pages 322f.

כִּי-כֻלָּהּ אֶךְ-נֹבְחָלָה  
יַעֲשֶׂה אֶת כָּל-  
יֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ

. . . for a full, yea,  
sudden end he will make  
of all the inhabitants  
of the earth;

The Targum retains the essential idea of the Hebrew but softens it slightly by changing כָּל-יֹשְׁבֵי ("all the inhabitants") to כָּל רְשָׁעִי ("all the wicked"). This change avoids stating that God would destroy everyone by asserting that He would destroy only all the wicked persons.

(2) ZEPHANIAH 1:12

לֹא-יַיִסִּיב יְהוָה וְלֹא  
יַרְעֵ

The Lord will not do good,  
nor will he do ill.

לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה קֵדְם יְהוָה  
לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה רָע וְאֵף לֹא  
לֵאשָׁא

There is no will before  
Yahweh to do good nor to  
do evil.

This translation avoids having anyone say that the Lord will not do either good or evil.

(3) ZEPHANIAH 3:5

יְהוָה צְדִיק בְּקִרְבָּהּ  
לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה עוֹלָה

The Lord within her is  
righteous, he does no  
wrong;

יְהוָה זָכָה אָמַר  
לְאִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁכִינָתָהּ  
בְּנוֹוָה וְלִי קִדְמוֹהִי  
לְמַעַבְדֵּי שֶׁקֶר

The righteous Yahweh says  
that he will cause His  
Shekinah to dwell in her  
midst and no one does  
falsely before Him.

This translation also avoids stating that God will not do wrong. Probably the expression בְּקִרְבָּהּ ("within her") accounts for the addition of Shekinah<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>See pages 305-317.

Another passage (Hosea 2:18[16]<sup>1</sup>) safeguards Deity by the elimination of the title 'Baal' for God. This translation also may result from a pro-Israel bias as well as from the desire to avoid a cultically offensive term applied to Deity.

In one passage the Davidic line is compared to Deity. This idea would be offensive for several reasons; the targumist softens it:

(4) ZECHARIAH 12:8

וּבֵית דָּוִד כְּאֱלֹהִים	... and the house of David shall be like God,
וּבֵית דָּוִד <sup>2</sup> כְּרִבְרֵי	... and the house of David will be as princes.

A similar desire to avoid implying that man is as great as, or greater than God, may account for the translation of Hosea 12:4(3)<sup>3</sup>. Alternately, the strong anthropomorphic description may be the reason.

(5) HOSEA 12:4(3)<sup>4</sup>

וּבְאוֹנוֹ שָׂרָה אִתּוֹ אֱלֹהִים	... and in his manhood he strove with God.
--------------------------------------	---

<sup>1</sup>Only instance of this in the Twelve; see page 200.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. "Onk. and Ps. Jon. Gen iii 5, vi 2, 4. xxxiii 10 Onk. has also רִבְרֵי," (Jansma, *op. cit.*, p. 116).

<sup>3</sup>Only instances in the Twelve of this idea.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Hosea 12:5(4) where the Masoretic Text also substitutes מַלְאֲכַי ("angel") for אֱלֹהִים ("God").

ובחוקפיה איהרר  
עים מלאכא

... and in his strength  
he prevailed with the  
angel.

Finally, in Hosea 1:6 the Targum softens the Hebrew which implies that God will have no mercy upon Israel. The clause, which the Targum adds, not only is favorable to God's character but also more favorable to Israel:

(6) HOSEA 1:6<sup>1</sup>

כי־נשא אשא להם

... to forgive them at  
all.

אם יחובון משבן  
אישבון להון

If they return, I will  
surely forgive them.

These passages illustrate the attempts of the targumist to avoid (or soften) statements in the Hebrew which were offensive to his theological concepts.

<sup>1</sup>In Micah 7:18, the translation is literal. These are the only two verses in the Twelve in which נשא is used in the meaning of God forgiving.



## CHAPTER IX

### THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND PROTECTIVE DEVICES USED IN THE TARGUM

Several different intermediaries and devices were added by the targumist to avoid the ascription of human form to Deity and/or to safeguard Him by the elimination of derogatory actions either performed by Him or directed towards Him, and the like. These devices and intermediaries have been constantly mentioned in the preceding chapters (VI - VIII) in Section III. These different added safeguards will be considered here separately, and, in the case of the intermediaries, some of their theological implications will be noted. An attempt will be made to discover the relationship, if any, which exists between these devices and intermediaries.

#### 1. THE FEAR AND/OR WORSHIP OF DEITY

Two Aramaic words which are almost synonymous are recurring constantly in the Targum. These words are: פולחן and דחלא. The former is from the root פלח meaning primarily to till or work. Thus it comes to mean service to man or Deity and, hence, to worship. The noun denotes servitude or service but is used especially to refer to the priestly (Temple) service and worship. The latter word (דחלא) is from the root דחל to be depressed, bent, and then to fear, shun, worship, and revere. The noun thus has reference either to the actor, i.e., the fearer or worshipper,

or to the recipient of the action, the thing feared, and, therefore, means either fear or deity. Consequently, this word comes to refer also to the fear or worship of Deity.

# (1) THE WORSHIP (פולחן) OF GOD

This noun occurs in the Twelve approximately forty<sup>1</sup> (or forty-two<sup>2</sup>) times. Usually this word has been added whenever a relationship between God and man, stated in anthropomorphic terms, conveyed a cultic (religious) connotation. Thus when man is said to leave (depart)<sup>3</sup>, go astray from<sup>4</sup>, turn away from<sup>5</sup>, forget<sup>6</sup> (or remember<sup>7</sup>) God, return to<sup>8</sup>, come (draw) near to<sup>9</sup>, be in dread of (come trembling to)<sup>10</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 1:2; 2:4 (twice), 5, 9, 15, 18; 3:3, 5, 5; 4:10, 12, 17; 5:4, 8; 6:1; 7:10; 8:3, 14; 9:1; 10:1; 11:10; 12:1, 7; 13:6; 14:3; Joel 2:12, 13; Amos 4:6, 8, 9, 10, 11; Jonah 2:8; Zephaniah 1:6; 3:2; Haggai 2:17; Zechariah 1:3; 11:8; Malachi 3:7.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 2:9; 9:8.

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 1:2 (אחר); 4:10 (עזב); 4:17 (a pro-Israel alteration -- idea of departure by man found in the Targum alone).

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 4:12; 9:1; cf. 8:3 where the targumist has understood פולחן to refer to God.

<sup>5</sup>Zephaniah 1:6; cf. addition in Targum of Hosea 5:8.

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 2:15; 8:14; 13:6 (שכח).

<sup>7</sup>Jonah 2:8 (זכר).

<sup>8</sup>Hosea 2:9; 3:5; 5:4; 6:1; 7:10; 12:7; 14:3; Joel 2:12, 13; Amos 4:6, 8, 9, 10, 11; Haggai 2:17; Zechariah 1:3; Malachi 3:7 (שוב).

<sup>9</sup>Zephaniah 3:2 (קרב); cf. addition in the Targum of Hosea 2:5.

<sup>10</sup>Hosea 3:5 (פחד).

walk after<sup>1</sup>, or seek<sup>2</sup> God, then God was safeguarded by the appropriate addition of פולחן or פולחן with the required pronominal suffix. In this manner the targumist eliminated the offensive anthropomorphic language and yet retained the meaning of the Hebrew, e.g., for one to return to God means that the person concerned has returned to the worship of God.

In five passages, however, פולחן occurs in situations where another device would have been expected. In Hosea 2:4(2) where Israel is described as Yahweh's wife and in 2:18(16) where Yahweh is stated to be Israel's husband, פולחן scarcely would have been anticipated. Normally the intermediary, the מימרא, was used wherever the description of God was extremely grossly anthropomorphic, e.g., when He is described as being like a farmer, as having parts of the human body, and the like. Therefore, this device (מימרא) would have been expected in Hosea 2:18(16). The context both in Hosea 2:18(16) and in Hosea 2:4(2)<sup>3</sup> was unsuitable for the use of מימרא. Moreover, since the targumist considered this chapter to be manifestly allegorical, he apparently thought the term פולחן to be more suitable for use in Hosea 2:18(16).

Probably a similar exegetical motive would explain

---

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 11:10 (הלך); cf. also Hosea 2:9(7).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 3:5 (בשר).

<sup>3</sup>For the circumlocution employed here, see pages 200f.

the use in Zechariah 11:8 where God stated that the people of Israel hated Him, although here another device easily could have been employed. The selection, however, of this word retained for the Aramaic translation the real meaning of the Hebrew and yet avoided the very offensive statement, especially from the mouth of God Himself. The other two passages are of a more cultic nature. In the last part of Hosea 2:4(2) פולחן occurs again in the allegorical interpretation of ונאפוניה מבין שדיה ("And her adulteries from between her breasts;"<sup>1</sup>) as referring to the worship (פולחן) of idols (פעווחא). Similarly in Hosea 10:1 Israel no longer increases the number of his altars, an especially offensive cultic concept, but rather he has multiplied worship (פולחן) at his altars.

Two more passages perhaps should be mentioned. In one (Hosea 2:9) an explanatory addition "when I used to be (in) service before Him", is made at the close of the verse, and in the other (Hosea 9:8) the statement that Ephraim was a watchman with my God (צנןפה אפרים עם-אלהי) was altered to refer to the worship of idols (מסכן בית ישראל דיתקיים להון (פולחן פעווחא)).

Therefore פולחן occurs in passages which are descriptive of the religious relationship between God and man and where the targumist possibly desired to emphasize this religious and cultic relationship.

---

<sup>1</sup>American Jewish Translation.

## (2) THE FEAR ( דחלא ) OF GOD

This particular word ( דחלא ) is used less frequently as a protective addition. In all, it occurs about twenty<sup>1</sup> times in the Twelve. In many of these places it corresponds to the use of מולח, e.g., to seek God<sup>2</sup>, to walk with Him<sup>3</sup>, to return to Him<sup>4</sup>, to depart from Him<sup>5</sup>, and to remember God<sup>6</sup>. Comparison of these passages with those which utilize the addition of מולח does not disclose any significant constant factor. In these instances, at least, the two different Aramaic words were regarded as synonymous. Perhaps they were introduced either by different translators or by different groups of translators.

דחלא, however, is used in certain places where מולח is excluded. For example, in Hosea 4:1,6; 6:3<sup>7</sup>, where the Hebrew refers to the knowledge of God, דחלא has been added, possibly to avoid any suggestion that God's knowledge might

---

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 4:1,6; 5:15; 6:3; 7:13; 8:10; 10:12; 13:13; 14:2; Amos 5:4,6; Micah 6:8; Habakkuk 2:14; Zephaniah 1:6; 2:3; Zechariah 8:6; 10:9; 11:13; Malachi 2:2 (twice).

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 5:15 ( שחר ); Hosea 10:12; Amos 5:4,6 ( דרש ); Zephaniah 1:6; 2:3 ( בקש ).

<sup>3</sup>Micah 6:8 ( צנע ).

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 14:2 ( שוב ).

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 7:13 ( ודר ).

<sup>6</sup>Zechariah 10:9 ( זכר ).

<sup>7</sup>Cf. the addition in the Targum of Hosea 13:13 and the substitution for glory in Habakkuk 2:14 (knowledge of God's glory).

be limited, as well as to avoid the anthropomorphic language. Moreover, דחלא unlike פולחן is used as a substitute for the personal pronoun<sup>1</sup>, where the targumist may have interpreted it as referring to Deity. This happens perhaps twice in Malachi 2:2 and possibly also in Hosea 8:10 and Zechariah 8:6. These passages also may stem from a Hebrew text which is slightly different from the Masoretic Text. Finally, in the Targum of Zechariah 11:13 God states that He has made his Fear (דחלא) precious in their sight. This may be the translation of the Hebrew "אשר יקרתי מעליהם" (". . . that I was prized<sup>c 3</sup> at of them."<sup>2</sup>). These passages are of particular interest because the Memra (מימרא) is the usual substitute for the personal pronoun whether it is expressly stated or implied by the verb in the Hebrew.

### (3) THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN פולחן AND דחלא

פולחן and דחלא, based upon the above cited occurrences in the Twelve, seem to be synonymous expressions which probably were introduced by different translators or groups of translators. The word, דחלא, however, is used apparently as a substitute for the personal pronoun in places where the context would not have been thought to suggest either פולחן or דחלא. The only known instances in the Twelve where פולחן is used as a substitute for the personal pronoun are where the sense of the passages naturally

<sup>1</sup>See following remark in Section (3).

<sup>2</sup>American Jewish Translation.



would suggest its use.

## 2. THE WILL (רעוּחַ) OF GOD

This word (רעוּחַ = pleasure, will, goodwill, ambition) is scarcely an anti-anthropomorphic device of any importance. In this capacity it occurs very plainly only once, namely, in Hosea 6:5, where it is a substitute for the mouth of God, but in Hosea 8:4 it is the means by which the targumist avoids the offensive statement by God that there existed something which He did not know. He interprets (and perhaps correctly) that the essential idea of the Hebrew is that an act had been performed which was contrary to the will of God, and so he translates ולא מרעוּחַ. Perhaps the most interesting of these passages occurs in Zechariah 11:11 where those who heed (שמר) God is altered by the Targum to those who perform His will -- a concept which avoids the offensive implications of the Hebrew and yet retains its substance.

The remaining instances are mainly of interpretative additions to the text which involve the idea of serving (doing) God's will, (e.g., Hosea 6:7; Habakkuk 3:2; Zechariah 11:12; Malachi 3:12 -- the last one, for instance, giving as the reason that Israel was praised by the heathen the fact that Israel performed God's will in His land.).

## 3. THE GLORY (קַרָּא) OF GOD

The word (קַרָּא)<sup>1</sup> is used in the Targum to translate

---

<sup>1</sup> קַרָּא is the usual translation of כְּבוֹד.

כבוד<sup>1</sup> in Haggai 2:7 and Malachi 2:2 and חור in Habakkuk 3:3. The word, however, occurs in some ten other passages as additions or substitutions.

In several passages the glory becomes an anti-anthropomorphic device. It is added in the Targum to avoid the concept of God standing ( נצב ) in Amos 9:1, to avoid the picture of God being seen in Habakkuk 3:10, and, in Malachi 1:5, to alter the statement that God is magnified to the conception of the glory of God being made great. In the same manner the glory together with other alterations avoids the idea of God having horses in Habakkuk 3:8, 15<sup>2</sup> and is involved in the anti-anthropomorphic alteration in Habakkuk 3:4<sup>3</sup>. Finally, קרא is added in Amos 9:6 and Zechariah 9:8 to the Shekinah and once in Habakkuk 3:4 without any apparent reason.

#### 4. THE POWER ( גבורה ) OF GOD

The word ( גבורה ) properly denotes the superiority, strength, or might of an object, animal, or person. When it refers to God it also may signify the Divine Majesty or even God Himself as well as the manifestations of His Power.

In the Targum this word occurs approximately sixteen<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>It is also used to convey the verbal idea in Haggai 1:8.

<sup>2</sup>See page 226, 260f.

<sup>3</sup>See page 313f.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 5:14; Amos 1:8; Habakkuk 3:2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 11; Zephaniah 1:4; 2:13; Zechariah 2:9(13); 9:8 (twice); 12:4; 13:7.

times and frequently is an anti-anthropomorphic device. Coupled with נחם ("blow, stroke") it is found five<sup>1</sup> times as a substitute for the יד ("hand") of Deity. In each instance the Hebrew conveys the idea of Divine punishment and implies that some mighty act is to be accomplished by Him. Twice (Zechariah 9:8; 12:14) the word (נִבֹרַחַא) occurs alone to avoid presenting the idea of God being the possessor of eyes. Already in the Hebrew there is the suggestion that the opening of God's eyes is a metaphorical figure -- the targumist interprets it as a favourable action on the part of Deity.

נִבֹרַחַא is also a device utilized to avoid the concept of weapons. Thus, it occurs for a bow in Habakkuk 3:9 and for a spear in Habakkuk 3:11.

In each example cited thus far the anthropomorphic picture implies the might of God, and this has been replaced by an anti-anthropomorphic expression which has heightened this implication into a stated certainty. In certain passages also the concept of God's power is not so self-evident. When נִבֹרַחַא is used to safeguard Deity in Habakkuk 3:2 from the anthropomorphic implication of having a mouth in the statement that His report (שִׁמְעָה) had been heard, the picture of fear, etc., in the context suggests the possibility that the report was a powerful one. The Targum has interpreted this possibility as being a certainty. Similarly the targumist added נִבֹרַחַא to describe the wrath (or vengeance) of God in Habakkuk 3:8.

---

<sup>1</sup>Amos 1:8 L; Zephaniah 1:4 L; 2:13 L; Zechariah 2:9(13) L; 13:7 L.

One of the most uncertain passages occurs in Habakkuk 3:6 where **לֹא הוֹלִיכוֹ עוֹלָם לוֹ** ("His goings are as of old."<sup>1</sup>) has been interpreted as **נְבוֹרָה עֲלֵמָא דִּילֵיהּ** ("the eternal power which is His."). Moreover, in several places **נְבוֹרָה** has been added apparently only with the motive of emphasizing the Majesty or Might of Deity, e.g., in Hosea 5:14, Habakkuk 3:3; Zechariah 9:8.

Hence, the targumist apparently used **נְבוֹרָה** when he either wished to stress the Might of God or interpreted the Hebrew to convey that idea.

#### 5. THE SHEKINAH ( **שְׁכִינָה** <sup>2</sup> ) OF GOD

The Shekinah is one of the most popular intermediary devices employed by the targumist. In all it occurs about thirty-four<sup>3</sup> times and is chiefly used to avoid limiting God to a given place. The use of the intermediary serves to make God less immanent and more transcendent, as well as more omnipresent, than our Masoretic Text does. Thus, the Shekinah becomes ". . . a way of speaking about God such as conveys

---

<sup>1</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>2</sup>The term, 'shekinah', is derived from the Hebrew root, **שָׁכַן**, ("to dwell"). The derived noun, therefore, means "that which dwells". This word does not occur in the Old Testament but frequently does occur in the Talmud and twice in the Midrash also.

<sup>3</sup>Hosea 2:5(3), 25(23); 5:6, 15; 9:3, 12; 11:9; 13:14; Joel 2:27; 4(3):17, 21; Amos 9:6; Micah 1:3; 3:4, 11; 4:2; 6:6; Habakkuk 2:20; 3:4, 8; Zephaniah 3:5, 7, 15, 17; Haggai 1:8; Zechariah 2:9, 14, 15; 3:2; 8:3; 9:1, 2, 8; and Malachi 3:12.

the truth of His omnipresence, accessibility and special activity within the created world without infringing the doctrine of His transcendence<sup>1</sup>.

The Shekinah implies the Divine Presence or Manifestation<sup>2</sup> and illustrates beautifully the paradox of Rabbinical theology which first makes God very aloof and transcendent and then strives by various means to bridge the gap which had been created between God and man. The Targum adds Shekinah whenever the Hebrew would limit God as to space<sup>3</sup>. Hence even the idea of the removal of God from a place would require this use of the Shekinah<sup>4</sup> which was extended to include the avoidance of such anthropomorphic possessions as land<sup>5</sup>, temple<sup>6</sup>, house<sup>7</sup>, etc. The Shekinah was used even to circumvent the statement that God was localized in heaven (on high<sup>8</sup>). Gradually the concept of the Shekinah in the Targum was

<sup>1</sup>Ramsey, A.M., op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>2</sup>The Shekinah is very closely connected with the Holy Spirit; see, for example, Box, G. H., op. cit., p. 117.

<sup>3</sup>See Section 1(1), pages 305ff.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Hosea 5:6; 9:12.

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 2:25; 9:3; cf. used with respect to Israel in Malachi 3:12.

<sup>6</sup>Habakkuk 2:20

<sup>7</sup>Micah 4:2; cf. pages 305ff for the usual avoidance of this anthropomorphic possession.

<sup>8</sup>Micah 6:6



extended (and personified<sup>1</sup>) to the point that it could be a substitute for God Himself, e.g., in Hosea 5:6 יסליק שכינתיהם ("His Shekinah <sup>will</sup> ascend from them,") appears for מלך ("... he has withdrawn from them,") and in Micah 3:11 for יהוה בקרבנו ("Is not the Lord in the midst of us?") the Targum reads הלא שכינתא דיהוה בינו ("Is not the Shekinah of Yahweh in our midst?")<sup>2</sup>. The identification of the Shekinah with God led to statements such as קדישא שכינתא ("My Shekinah is holy,") in Hosea 11:9, and the like.

Therefore, the Shekinah is the standard term which is added when God is limited by space in the Hebrew text, i.e., it is used whenever the omnipresence of Deity is to be asserted<sup>3</sup>.

#### 6. THE MEMRA (ממרא<sup>4</sup>) OF GOD

This is the final intermediary added in the Targum to avoid certain types of anthropomorphisms which will be

---

<sup>1</sup>The "... shekinah acquires what semblance of personality it has solely by being a circumlocution for God in contexts where personal states or actions are attributed to him." (Moore, George Foot: "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology", Harvard Theological Review 15(1922): p. 59).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Targum of Habakkuk 3:4.

<sup>3</sup>Moore, op. cit., p. 56.

<sup>4</sup>This word is the Aramaic equivalent of the late Hebrew word, מאמר, which is derived from אמר ("to say"). Hence Memra can mean, "dictum". Cf. Moore, op. cit., p. 47.



discussed here<sup>1</sup>. In fact, in the Targum the Memra is the favourite anti-anthropomorphic expression<sup>2</sup>.

No doubt the roots of this intermediary are to be found in the Old Testament as Oesterley and Box<sup>3</sup> observe. Certainly passages such as, "I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord,"<sup>4</sup>; "He has despised the word of the Lord,"<sup>5</sup>; "The word of the Lord tried him,"<sup>6</sup>; "He sendth His word and healeth them,"<sup>7</sup>; "Thy word have I hid in my heart,"<sup>8</sup>; and "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made"<sup>9</sup>; all contributed to laying the foundation for the subsequent development of this concept. On the other hand, it should be remembered, that Memra customarily is not used to translate the word (מִלָּמָה<sup>10</sup>) of

---

<sup>1</sup>For other intermediaries see pages 400ff.

<sup>2</sup>It is strange that such a popular device is essentially limited by the rabbis to the Targums. "Possibly on account of the Christian dogma, rabbinic theology, outside of the Targum literature, made little use of the term 'Memra'." (Kohler, Kaufmann, "Memra", The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 8, 1905-6, New York City: Funk and Wagnalls Co., p. 465).

<sup>3</sup>Oesterley, W.O.E. and Box, G.H., The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Ltd., 1911, 2nd and revised edition), pp. 204-210.

<sup>4</sup>Deuteronomy 5:5.

<sup>5</sup>Numbers 15:31.

<sup>6</sup>Psalms 105:19.

<sup>7</sup>Psalms 107:20.

<sup>8</sup>Psalms 119:11.

<sup>9</sup>Psalms 33:6.

<sup>10</sup>The usual translation is מִלָּמָה ("word"), (so Moore, op. cit., pp. 45f.)

God or expressions like 'God spake' or 'God said'.

In the post-Biblical world God's creative activity was conceived, as above in Psalms 33:6, as being meditated, as it were, by (through) the Word of God. This development of the concept of the Word prepared the way for the targumist. Other instances of the development of this concept are: "In the words of the Lord are his works,"<sup>1</sup> and "O God . . . Who hast made all things with thy word . . ."<sup>2</sup>

The gradual development of this intermediate agent, however, alone would not account for the theological position of the targumist. Again the decisive factor is the belief in the transcendent Deity who, although He was not directly (*i.e.* personally) involved in the events of history, could not be divorced from them. It was inconceivable that God should have less interest in His people, etc., than He had shown in former ages. Therefore, although ". . . it was held to be derogatory on the part of Jehovah to concern Himself personally with mere human affairs, . . . On the other hand, it was inconceivable that God should forget about, and forsake, His own creation."<sup>3</sup> In this connection a distinction must be made between the doctrine of God as held by the targumist and the doctrine of the Alexandrian theologian. The former held

---

<sup>1</sup>Ecclesiastius 42:15.

<sup>2</sup>Wisdom 9:1.

<sup>3</sup>Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 209.

that God is virtually unknowable<sup>1</sup> while the latter considered Him to be without qualities<sup>2</sup>. Moreover, the targumist, unlike Philo, did not ". . . speculate about the position of the Word relatively to God . . . [He was] content to connect . . . [his] generalizations with the O T representation of the creation of the world mediately through Wisdom.<sup>3</sup>" In this he did not develop further the "obscure and intermediate position" of Wisdom by his intermediary of the Memra. Hence, the Memra occupies essentially the same position in the Targum as the earlier concept of the Wisdom (  $\Pi\omega\sigma\pi$  or  $\sigma\omega\phi\iota\alpha$  ) of Judaism although the Memra is given perhaps wider scope than the earlier Wisdom.

#### (1) THE USE OF MEMRA TO AVOID ANTHROPOMORPHIC EXPRESSIONS

Altogether Memra occurs almost one hundred times in the Targum<sup>4</sup>. In the Targum a distinction is made between

---

<sup>1</sup>Fairweather, W., "Development of Doctrine in the Apocryphal Period", Hastings, James, A Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1904), Extra Vol., p. 284.

<sup>2</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>3</sup>Fairweather, op. cit., p. 284.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 1:7,9; 2:4,11,17; 3:2; 5:7,8,12,14(twice); 6:5,7; 7:13,14; 8:4; 9:10,17; 10:9,10; 11:4,8,9(twice),10,11; 13:7,8,9(twice),14,15; 14:1,6,9(twice); Joel 2:11(twice),13,17,23; 4(3):8,16; Amos 1:2; 4:11; 5:14; 6:8; 9:2(twice),3,4; Obadiah 4,18; Jonah 2:5; 3:5; 4:2; Micah 1:2; 2:7,13; 3:11; 4:4; 7:7,10,14,19; Nahum 1:7; Habakkuk 1:12,13; 3:2,5,6,9,11,13,18; Zephaniah 3:2,8,11,14; Haggai 1:12,13; 2:4; Zechariah 1:3,4; 2:9; 3:7; 4:6; 6:15; 7:12; 8:14,23; 10:5,7,12; 11:8; 12:5; Malachi 3:5,7,14.

the Word as spoken (Pithgama<sup>1</sup>) and the Word as speaking or revealing Himself (Memra)<sup>2</sup>. Thus מִמְרָא is almost never used when דָּבַר would have been used in the Hebrew<sup>3</sup>; instead מִיְּחִנָּה is used. Memra is reserved (in part at least) to avoid the grosser anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew. Thus Memra occurs when God is compared to a farmer<sup>4</sup>, is described as being a witness<sup>5</sup>, or is stated not to be or to function in the capacity of a man<sup>6</sup>. It is used to avoid ascribing to God certain portions of the human body; thus, the Memra is a substitute for God's eyes<sup>7</sup>, heart<sup>8</sup>, mouth<sup>9</sup>, feet<sup>10</sup>, voice<sup>11</sup>,

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. e.g., Amos 3:1; 5:10; 7:16; Jonah 3:6; Micah 2:7; Habakkuk 2:3; Zephaniah 2:5; Haggai 1:3; 2:5; Zechariah 1:6; 4:6; 7:7; 9:1; 11:11.

<sup>2</sup>Edersheim, *op. cit.*, I, p. 47.

<sup>3</sup>Apparent exceptions are found in Hosea 13:14 (דָּבַר here is pointed "plague" in the Masoretic Text) and Joel 2:11.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 11:4 E.

<sup>5</sup>Micah 1:2 E; Malachi 3:5.

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 2:4; 11:9 E.

<sup>7</sup>Amos 9:3 L, 4 L; Jonah 2:5 L; Habakkuk 1:13 L.

<sup>8</sup>Hosea 11:8.

<sup>9</sup>Hosea 6:5; Micah 4:4; cf. also Joel 4(3):8; Obadiah 18.

<sup>10</sup>Habakkuk 3:5 L.

<sup>11</sup>Joel 2:11 L; 4(3):16 L; Amos 1:2 L; Haggai 1:12 L; Zechariah 6:15 L.



hand<sup>1</sup>, and even God's nephesh<sup>2</sup> and spirit<sup>3</sup>.

Certain anthropomorphic actions<sup>4</sup> of God also are eliminated by the use of Memra. Moreover, certain derogatory actions of men towards God which imply His anthropomorphic nature are now directed towards the Memra instead, e.g., rebellion against God<sup>5</sup>, being against God<sup>6</sup>, leaning on God<sup>7</sup>, hearing<sup>8</sup> or looking<sup>9</sup> to Him, answering (responding)<sup>10</sup>, waiting on God<sup>11</sup>, and rejoicing<sup>12</sup>, believing<sup>13</sup> and being strong<sup>14</sup> in God. The anthropopathic action of God repenting<sup>15</sup> which also

---

<sup>1</sup>Amos 9:2 L; see section 4, pages 337ff.

<sup>2</sup>Amos 6:8; Zechariah 11:8. The term נפשו ("by his soul") in the Hebrew usually means "by himself" -- see Knight, op. cit., p. 42; cf. pages 37, footnote 2.

<sup>3</sup>Micah 2:7; Zechariah 4:6; 7:12.

<sup>4</sup>Redeem (Hosea 1:7; 3:2; Micah 7:10); Chastise (?) (Hosea 10:10); Meet (Hosea 9:10 E); Answering (Hosea 14:9); and look on (Hosea 14:9).

<sup>5</sup>Hosea 5:7,8; 6:7 (twice); 7:13 L,14L; 10:9 (addition); 14:1; Habakkuk 3:2 (addition), 6 (addition); Zephaniah 3:11 L.

<sup>6</sup>Hosea 6:5; 13:9.

<sup>7</sup>Micah 3:11; Nahum 1:7 L.

<sup>8</sup>Hosea 9:17 L; Zechariah 1:4 L.

<sup>9</sup>Micah 7:7.

<sup>10</sup>Hosea 2:17.

<sup>11</sup>Zephaniah 3:8.

<sup>12</sup>Joel 2:23; Habakkuk 3:18; Zechariah 10:7.

<sup>13</sup>Jonah 3:5; Zephaniah 3:2.

<sup>14</sup>Zechariah 10:12; 12:5.

<sup>15</sup>"Places in which it is said that God 'repented' (was sorry, changed his mind) are treated in various ways, according to the context." (Moore, op. cit., p. 50).

implies that He is changeable is avoided by the addition of Memra in Joel 2:13 L; Jonah 4:2; Zechariah 8:14. Memra is also the usual device to eliminate the animistic<sup>1</sup> description of Deity.

Finally, the targumist apparently had a text unaltered by the Sopherim, and, so to protect God from the derogatory and anthropomorphic implication that it was possible for God to die, he translated (in Habakkuk 1:12) the idea as מִימְרָךְ קִיִּים לְעַלְמֵי יְהוָה ("Your word endures [is established] forever, O Yahweh,")<sup>2</sup>.

In one respect the intermediary Memra seemingly functions in the same capacity as the Shekinah -- namely to deny place to God. Whenever the statement occurs that God is with Israel, the Targum has rendered this as, e.g., מִימְרָא

וְאֵנִי לֹא־אֱהִי לָכֶם ("The Word of Yahweh, the God of Hosts, is at your assistance,")<sup>3</sup>. This statement occurs in the negative in Hosea 1:9 where the Hebrew reads וְאֵנִי לֹא־אֱהִי לָכֶם ("... and I am not your God,") in Hosea 11:11 as an addition, and in Hosea 13:9 where the targumist changes the entire verse to avoid the statement that Israel was against God. The question, therefore, arises: why did the targumist use Memra here instead of Shekinah? The reason in

---

<sup>1</sup>See section (3), pages 239ff,

<sup>2</sup>See page 14.

<sup>3</sup>Amos 5:14 E; cf. Haggai 1:3 E; 2:4 E; Zechariah 8:23 E; 10:5 E.



Hosea 1:9 is fairly obvious. He substituted Memra for the personal pronoun, as he frequently does,<sup>1</sup> and then substituted **בסערכון** for **לכם** in order to make the meaning intelligible. Perhaps, having established this pattern here, it was easy to follow whenever the comparatively similar Hebrew clause **אחכם אני** or one of its equivalents occurred. If so, the addition in Hosea 11:11, its inclusion in the re-constructed verse of Hosea 13:9, and its use as the translation of **ויהיה**<sup>2</sup> **בראשם** ("... the Lord at their head,"<sup>3</sup>) may be understood easily. In any case, the targumist preferred not to translate these verses in a manner which would require the use of the Shekinah but apparently interpreted them in some anthropomorphic sense.

Moreover, the omnipresence of Deity is safeguarded by Memra (or by the statement that God is acting by means of [with] His Memra) in several instances of motion. The verbs are limited to the hiphil of **ייר**<sup>3</sup> and to **שוב**<sup>4</sup>. Finally, the omnipresence of God also is safeguarded by the alteration of the question **איה אלהיהם** ("Where is their God?") to **אן דאיתפריקו במימר אלההון** ("Where are those who were redeemed by the Word of their God?")<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>For example Hosea 5:14; 8:4, et. al.

<sup>2</sup>Micah 2:13.

<sup>3</sup>Amos 9:2; Obadiah 4.

<sup>4</sup>Hosea 2:11 E; 11:9 E; Micah 7:19 L; Zechariah 1:3; Malachi 3:7.

<sup>5</sup>Joel 2:17.

These passages which use Memra as a means (completely or partially) to avoid the limitation of Deity as to space and motion, may, of course, result from an anti-anthropomorphic bias, or they may be illustrative of the instances "... where the Targum inserts the word Memra . . . even when there is no danger of anthropomorphism."<sup>1</sup> More likely they are illustrative of Ginsburger's<sup>2</sup> rule: "Whenever a relation is predicted<sup>a</sup> of God, through which His spiritual presence an earthly being must be assumed, the paraphrase with Memra is employed."<sup>3</sup>

The motivation, however, becomes increasingly less clear when Memra is used as a substitute for a possession as, for instance, a staff<sup>4</sup>, an arrow<sup>5</sup>, or as a substitute for מַשְׁמֶרֶת<sup>6</sup> (charge, service). While the elimination of the first two (staff and arrow) is anti-anthropomorphic, to alter the concept of keeping God's charges scarcely can be so regarded. Thus, possibly these alterations, following Nahmanides<sup>7</sup>, suggest "that the Memra has a deep theological

---

<sup>1</sup>Abelson, J., op. cit., p. 152. Abelson here refers to Nahmanides' statement.

<sup>2</sup>Ginsburger, M., "Die Anthropomorphisms in den Thargum-im", Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie (Editors, Lipsius, Pfeleiderer, Shrader; Braunschweig: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1891), Vol. 17.

<sup>3</sup>Abelson's translation, op. cit., p. 151.

<sup>4</sup>Micah 7:14.

<sup>5</sup>Habakkuk 3:11.

<sup>6</sup>Zechariah 3:7; Malachi 3:14.

<sup>7</sup>So Abelson, op. cit., p. 152.

or mystical significance."<sup>1</sup>

The scarcity<sup>2</sup> of these instances in the Twelve has prevented the discovery of this significance in this investigation.

## (2) THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE MEMRA TO THE SHEKINAH

The first, apparently self-evident, distinction between Memra and Shekinah is that the Memra is used to avoid the grosser anthropomorphic and animistic descriptions of Deity while the Shekinah avoids the limitations of Deity to space. Hence Memra was used at times in connection with God's land, house, etc.

Secondly, the Shekinah is far more impersonal<sup>3</sup> than the Memra<sup>4</sup>. Sanday<sup>5</sup>, moreover, maintains that the Memra participates actively in Israel's redemption, whereas the Shekinah does not. This is not completely true because already in the Targum the Shekinah is becoming personalized<sup>6</sup>, and in

---

<sup>1</sup>Abelson (loc. cit.), et al.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. the Memra in Habakkuk 3:9,13 where the reason for its presence is especially obscure.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Sandy, W., "God (in N T)", Hastings, J., A Dictionary of the Bible, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1905), II, p. 207, and Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 218.

<sup>4</sup>On the other hand, Knight (op. cit., p. 105) considers that the Shekinah is the next step forward in the Targum from the Memra.

<sup>5</sup>Sanday, op. cit., p. 207.

<sup>6</sup>At least to the point of identification with God; cf. Abelson, op. cit., p. 79.

the Targum of Habakkuk 3:8 the Shekinah is described as being redemption and strength to the Israelite peoples.<sup>1</sup>

Thirdly, the Shekinah especially has reference to the visible (and invisible) manifestation of the presence of Deity, whereas Memra is both distinguished from God and yet a mode of God's revelation of Himself<sup>2</sup>.

#### 7. THE DISTINCTIVE USE OF THESE DEVICES IN THE TARGUM

These six "terms" which have been discussed above are not used indiscriminately but follow a set pattern. If the exact extent that each targumist (or school of targumists) translated were known, the pattern would no doubt be clearer and more consistent. Yet even in this "hodge-podge", the following distinctions are apparent:

- (1) The words יְהוָה and אֱלֹהִים were used when the targumist interpreted the action of man towards God as being essentially a religious action;

---

<sup>1</sup>Abrahams distinguishes between the Memra, Glory (Yeqara) and the Shekinah slightly differently. He considers the Memra "... to express the invisible presence of God in man; ... [the] glory, to express the visible appearance of God;" but the Shekinah to refer "... to both the visible and the invisible Presence, especially when it is conceived not only as a momentary revelation, but as a continuous religious experience." (Abrahams, *op. cit.*, pp. 51f.) The last is especially important -- that the Shekinah refers to a continuous religious experience, not so much to a momentary one. This may explain the use of Memra where the Hebrew says that God is with them. The targumist may have interpreted this to be of "momentary" (i.e., slight) duration and hence, preferred the use of Memra there to Shekinah.

<sup>2</sup>Fairweather, *op. cit.*, p. 284; Edersheim, *op. cit.*, I, p. 47.

- (2) The Will of God as an anti-anthropomorphic device apparently was not extensively nor consistently used;
- (3) To a great extent this is also true of the glory of God, although several times the visibility of God is plainly involved -- the Glory, however, is not identical with the Shekinah. Shekinah translates the Hebrew **שְׁכִינָה** only once<sup>1</sup> (Zechariah 2:9), although the two are closely associated in Amos 9:6 and Zechariah 9:8;
- (4) The Power of God stresses His omnipotence and, consequently, is used for the hand of God when it expresses the Might of God;
- (5) The Shekinah is used to convey the immanence of the transcendent, holy, and yet omnipresent God;
- (6) The Memra is used when the relationship predicated of God requires not only His spiritual presence but also a physical one -- thus the Memra is used to avoid the grosser anthropomorphisms found in the Twelve;
- (7) Memra and Shekinah acquire to a great extent what semblance of personality they have in the Targum "... by being a circumlocution for God in contexts

---

<sup>1</sup>So Ramsey, op. cit., p. 19.



where personal states or actions are attributed to him,<sup>1</sup>"; and

- (8)<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the Targum was written for the simple people, not for the educated ones. Streeter maintains that the Targums were ". . . popular renderings of the Old Testament lessons intended for congregations the majority of whom knew neither Hebrew nor Greek, but were sufficiently advanced to find difficulty in the more startling anthropomorphic expressions of the Old Testament . . ."<sup>3</sup> If so, then the "Word of the Lord" may be their way". . . of struggling to put the idea of immanence into ordinary terms, and to express their belief that God's will was a fact of experience in the world

---

<sup>1</sup>Moore (op. cit., p. 59); cf. Box, op. cit., p. 111. In this connection Kohler's suggestion that the rabbinical schools gave up the personified Memra and replaced it by the Torah or Spirit of God because of the Christian exegetical treatment of the Word is most interesting; see K. Kohler, Jewish Theology (New York: MacMillan Co., 1923), p. 199.

<sup>2</sup>These works by Moore and Knight were unavailable to this investigator until after the thesis had been completed. Hence, only scattered footnotes have been added. This investigator, although agreeing with them in part, feels that perhaps they have pushed the case too far against the idea that the Memra and Shekinah were intermediary persons. Probably these devices were personalized to a certain extent but not to the extent that many Christian authors have attempted to prove. A mediate position is to be preferred, this investigator believes.

<sup>3</sup>Streeter, B. H., The Four Gospels A Study of Origins, (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1927), p. 375.



of matter."<sup>1</sup> Likewise, the Shekinah would not be something (or person) which ". . . takes the place of God, but a more reverent way of saying 'God'."<sup>2</sup>

### 8. CONCLUSION

Unlike the examination of the Septuagint, the Targum clearly exhibits an anti-anthropomorphic and anti-anthropopathic tendency. In chapter six about eighty-six percent of the passages examined are anti-anthropomorphic. Only about three percent were uncertain, and about ten percent are substantially unaltered.

In chapter seven which considered the anthropopathism and the "lesser anthropomorphic" expressions of the Masoretic Text, the percentage of passages which, in the Targum, definitely avoid the anthropopathic and anthropomorphic expressions of the Hebrew text, is less -- only about seventy-one (or -two) percent of the passages examined. A larger number of uncertain passages are found -- about nineteen percent. The number of substantially unaltered passages is almost the same -- nine percent.

In chapter eight, eighty-two percent of the passages which describe God in a certain place are avoided in the Targum. Two percent are uncertain, and sixteen percent of the passages still confine Deity to a given locality. On the

---

<sup>1</sup>Knight, op. cit., p. 85.

<sup>2</sup>Moore, op. cit., p. 58.

other hand only sixty-one percent of the passages which in the Hebrew text describe God as moving about are avoided, whereas about seven percent of these passages are uncertain. Moreover, about thirty-three percent still retain the idea of God in motion in the Targum.

In chapter eight certain offensive concepts were considered also. Almost all of these passages are altered (over ninety percent). In less than ten percent of the passages discussed there the targumist failed to avoid the offensive concept.

In these three chapters over five hundred passages have been considered. In about seventy-seven percent of these passages the targumist clearly has made his translation because of a theological bias. In approximately eleven percent of the passages uncertainty exists as to the reason for the rendering in the Targum, and in some thirteen percent of the passages the translations in the Targum apparently do not reflect a theological bias on the part of the translator.

These figures as well as a consideration of the passages compel an investigator to conclude that the targumist allowed his theological beliefs to affect his translations.

## APPENDIX I

### CULTIC PROTECTION IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The desire to protect God led the targumist<sup>1</sup>, the talmudist, the midrashist, and the (h)aggadist to make certain lexical and other alterations pertaining to the protection of the sacred and profane cultic objects, persons, etc. For example, the Targum distinguishes very carefully between the true God and the idol by reserving אלהים to be used solely for the former and (a) different and derogatory word(s) to be used for the latter. This distinction is not carried out by the Septuagint<sup>2</sup>.

Moreover, the Septuagint, unlike the Targum<sup>3</sup>, does not maintain a distinction between the true and false prophets or priests, secular and holy statues<sup>4</sup>, etc. Probably there is no distinction meant in the alteration in Hosea 4:19 from

זבֿח ("sacrifice") to θυσιαστηριων ("altar"). On the other hand the addition of ψευδο- ("false") as a prefix in Zechariah 13:2<sup>5</sup> may indicate the beginning of a distinction between the true and false prophets<sup>6</sup> or may be an addition to avoid the

---

<sup>1</sup>See Appendix IV.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Zephaniah 1:5 (זבֿח is translated as κυριου ).

<sup>3</sup>See Appendix IV, page ?

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Churgin, op. cit., pp. 117f.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Hosea 6:5.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. the distinction the Targum makes, Appendix IV, pages 397f.

suggestion that God would eliminate the true prophet(s):

וְגַם אֶת־הַנְּבִיאִים  
אֶעֱבִיר...

. . . and also I will  
remove . . . the  
prophets . . .

και τους ψευδοπροφητας<sup>1</sup> . . .  
εξαρω

And I will remove [carry  
away] the false prophets  
. . .

The context plainly shows that the prophets referred to in Zechariah 13:2 are false prophets<sup>2</sup>, and this fact may indicate why Zechariah did not use the epithet "false."<sup>3</sup>

In addition to this there are other translations which may have been adopted from a desire to protect the cultus.

(1) THE TEREBINTH: HOSEA 4:13<sup>4</sup>

תַּחַת אֶלֶן וְתַחַת  
אֶלֶן

. . . under oak, poplar,  
and terebinth,

υποκατω δρυος και λευκης<sup>5</sup>  
και δενδρου<sup>6</sup> συσκιαζοντος<sup>7</sup>

. . . under an oak and a  
beech and a shady tree,

<sup>1</sup>So also the Syriac, Vulgate (Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 416) and Mitchell, Smith, Bower, *op. cit.*, p. 339, and the Targum (*loc. cit.*).

<sup>2</sup>"LXX. understand 'The prophets' correctly as ψευδοπροφητας . . ." [false prophets] (Lowe, *op. cit.*, p. 114).

<sup>3</sup>Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 416; cf. Mitchell, Smith, Bower, *op. cit.*, p. 337.

<sup>4</sup>Only passage in the Twelve referring to the terebinth.

<sup>5</sup>πευκης in 86<sup>c</sup>, Sa<sup>p</sup>; cf. Isaiah 41:19.

<sup>6</sup>κεδρου in 410.

<sup>7</sup>α' = και τερεβινθου ; σ' = και πλανανου επισκιαζουσιν.

The translation of תְּרֵפִים<sup>1</sup> ("and terebinth") by  
 και δένδρου σκιαζόντος ("and shady tree") avoids the  
 cultically offensive term, "terebinth".

(2) TERE<sup>A</sup>PHIM

[1] HOSEA 3:4

תִּפְסֵךְ יְאִי כְּצִבּוֹן  
 מִדְּרָגִים

... or pillar, without  
 ephod or terephim.

a/

οὐδε ὄντας θυσια-  
 στηριον<sup>2</sup> οὐδε ιερατει-  
 ας οὐδε δηλων

... and without an altar  
 and without a priesthood,  
 and without manifestations;

This translation avoids the reference to the terephim  
 ( מִדְּרָגִים ) by the translation of οὐδε δηλων ("without  
 manifestations"). Elsewhere δηλων translates מִדְּרָגִים<sup>3</sup>. If  
 δηλων<sup>4</sup> represents מִדְּרָגִים, the translator must have misread  
 his text or possessed a different one. Since, however, he  
 also translates ephod (תִּפְסֵךְ) by ιερατείας ("priesthood"),  
 avoiding another cultically offensive word, he probably  
 introduced both changes with deliberate intent.

<sup>1</sup>Harper, Wellhausen, Nowack, and Gardner consider the Masoretic Text to be in error here and suggest emendations (so Harper, op. cit., pp. 260f).

<sup>2</sup>οι λ' = στηλης.

<sup>3</sup>So Harper (op. cit., p. 216) and Cheyne (op. cit., p. 121). Graetz thus emends (op. cit., p. 12) and Harper (op. cit., p. 216).

<sup>4</sup>According to Bagster, op. cit., p. 1072, footnote λ, δηλων has reference to the Urim and the Thummim or else to the Urim alone. If this assumption is correct, the choice of δηλων follows naturally upon his selection of ιερατείας to translate תִּפְסֵךְ.



## [2] ZECHARIAH 10:2

כי התרפים דברו-  
ן

For the terēphim utter  
nonsense,

· δι·ο·τι· ο·ι· απο·φθε·γγο·με·νοι  
· ε·λα·λη·σαν· κα·που·ς<sup>1</sup>

Because the prophesiers  
spoke of labours,

Although this translation of התרפים ("terēphim") as  
οι αποφθεγγομενοι<sup>2</sup> ("the prophesiers") avoids the cultic-  
ally offensive word -- 'terēphim', the reason for the selection  
of οι αποφθεγγομενοι is uncertain. The word תרפים is not  
translated consistently in the Septuagint by a single word<sup>3</sup>.

## (3) IDOLS: HABAKKUK 2:18

רש ומוֹרָא<sup>4</sup>

. . . a teacher of lies?<sup>5</sup>

פֶּ֫בַע בְּאַנְטָאִסְיָא<sup>6</sup> פְּשׁוּדָה

. . . a false image. . .<sup>7</sup>

The Septuagint translator may have objected to the idea

<sup>1</sup> α' = ανωφελες ; σ' = ουκ οντα .

<sup>2</sup>A solecism (Jansma, *op. cit.*, p. 82). Elsewhere  
αποφθεγγομενοι translates כֹּזֵב, נֹבֵא, נֹבִיא, נֹבֵעַ, עֹנֵן, סֹס  
(Jansma, *loc. cit.*).

<sup>3</sup>Lowe, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

<sup>4</sup>Kennedy (*op. cit.*, p. 11) emends to ומוֹרָא, trans-  
lating clause as "and an object of fear".

<sup>5</sup>"By this is meant not an idolatrous priest but the  
idol itself," (Stonehouse, G.G.V., and Wade, G.W., *The Books  
of the Prophets Zephaniah and Nahum and the Book of the  
Prophet Habakkuk* [London: Methuen and Co., 1929], p. 193).

<sup>6</sup>Reinke (*op. cit.*, p. 123) suggests that the Septu-  
agint read פֶּ֫בַע .

<sup>7</sup>A literal translation.



that anyone could credit an idol with teaching anything, even lies!

(4) PILLAR (IDOL, STATUTE)<sup>1</sup>

HOSEA 10:1<sup>2</sup>

הִשְׁמִיכוּ מַצֻּבֹתָיו

. . . he improved his pillars.

ωκοδομησαν στηλας

. . . he erected pillars.

Although the translator avoided מַצֻּבֹת ("pillars") in Hosea 3:4, he has retained the idea in Hosea 10:1,2 and Micah 5:13(12). Therefore, the conclusion cannot be reached that the translator sought to avoid reference to pillars which were objectionable to the cultus.

(5) SACRIFICE

In secular, non-theological passages the word ( מִנְחָה , "sacrifice") is translated with the meaning of "a present".

[1] HOSEA 10:6

מִנְחָה לְמֶלֶךְ יִרְיָ

For a present to King Contentious;<sup>3</sup>

or possibly read  
מִנְחָה לְמֶלֶךְ יִרְיָ  
= to the great king.

ξενια τω βασιλει  
Ιαριμ

. . . as a present to the king Iarim.

<sup>1</sup>See also Hosea 3:4, page 358. The Septuagint of Hosea 3:4 also has an interesting translation of ephod.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Hosea 10:2; Micah 5:13(12).

<sup>3</sup>American Jewish Translation.

In theological passages where **זבח** ("sacrifice") has reference to the cultus, it is translated literally as **θυσια**, for example:

[2] ZEPHANIAH 3:10<sup>1</sup>

**יבלי זבחתי**

. . . shall bring my offering.

**οισουσιν θυσιας  
μοι**

. . . they shall bring sacrifices for me.

Since the translator of the Twelve uses two different words to translate **זבח** ("offering") depending upon whether it means to give tribute or gifts to men or whether **זבח** refers to offerings to Deity, this distinction may have resulted from an embryonic desire to protect the cultic idea of sacrifice.

(6) NEW MOONS: HOSEA 5:7

**עתה יאכלם חדש  
את-חלקיהם**

Now the new month shall devour them with their fields.

**νυν καταφαγεται  
αυτους η ερυσιβη  
και τους κληρους  
αυτων**

. . . the cankerworm  
[mildew<sup>2</sup>] shall now devour them and their portions.

The commentators have suggested many Hebrew equivalents for **η ερυσιβη** ("the cankerworm, mildew"<sup>3</sup>). The best suggestions for a misread or different text are the proposals made by

<sup>1</sup>See also Joel 1:9,13; 2:14; Amos 5:22,25; Malachi 1:10, 11,13; 2:12,13; 3:3f.

<sup>2</sup>So Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 268.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Nyberg (*op. cit.*, p. 37) who says: "**η ερυσιβη** = **חֲרָשׁ** st. **חֲרָשׁ**, eine verzweifelte Konjektur."

Harper and Wellhausen. Harper<sup>1</sup> suggests that the translator read חרש = חרס<sup>2</sup>. Wellhausen<sup>3</sup> suggests that ερυσίβη may be a corruption of ερυς which was a transliteration of חרש. Although either of these suggestions are plausible, the translator may have introduced the change to avoid mentioning the "new moons". Of course, the Septuagint could be an accurate translation of the original Hebrew text which has been corrupted into our present Masoretic Text.

Finally, there are three passages which may indicate that the ideas of feasts and of the temple were given increased importance at the time when the Septuagint was being translated.

#### (7) FEASTS

##### [1] HOSEA 12:9(10)

כִּי־מִיָּמֵינוּ

As in the days of the appointed season.<sup>4</sup>

καθως ημερα εορτης

. . . as in the days of a festival.

##### [2] ZEPHANIAH 3:18a

וּלְנוֹיָם מִמְּנוּעַד

. . . from the appointed season,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Harper, op. cit., p. 268.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 37) who says: " = חרש st. חרס, eine verzweifelt Konjektur." ἡ ερυσίβη

<sup>3</sup>So Harper, loc. cit.

<sup>4</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>5</sup>So American Jewish Translation, The Revised Standard Version (p. 982) translates as the Septuagint. Its footnote ] indicates that the Hebrew is obscure.

ως εν ημερα εορτης

. . . as in the day of  
a festival;

Most commentators<sup>1</sup> follow the Septuagint and add this to verse 17.

# (8) TEMPLE

In Haggai 2:9, at the close of the verse, the translator adds και ειρηνην ψυχης εις περιποιησιν παντι τω κτιζοντι του αναστησαι τον ναον τουτου (" . . . even peace of mind for a possession to everyone active in again raising up this temple.")<sup>2</sup>.

In conclusion, in Hosea 13:2, the Septuagint is perhaps less acceptable, cultically, than the Masoretic Text.

לָהֶם הֵם אֹמְרִים זָבָח  
אֲדָם עֹגְלִים יִשְׁקֹן

. . . to these they say  
sacrifices of men kissing  
calves!<sup>3</sup>

αυτοις αυτοι  
λεγουσι θυσατε  
ανθρωπους, μοσ-  
χοι γαρ εκλελοιπασι

. . . for them, They say,  
Sacrifice men, for young  
bulls have failed.

If the Septuagint represents a text more original, or

<sup>1</sup>See Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 262 for a partial list.

<sup>2</sup>Treitel (op. cit., p. 233) says: "Haggai 2:9 fügt vertent der Uebersetzung von וְלִי שָׁלוֹם hinzu, wie solche Zusätze überhaupt zum Handwerkszeuge der Septuaginta gehören . . . den Frieden des Herzens will ich geben dem, der mithilft den Tempel Gottes wiederaufzubauen, ein Zusatz, der gewiss sinnig ist als nähere Ausführung des Thomas von Friedensgewährung."

<sup>3</sup>Following Revised Standard Version, footnote j, page 945, essentially, but not completely.

one closer to the original, than our Masoretic Text, the alteration<sup>1</sup> by a later copyist to our present Masoretic Text would not be surprising.

---

<sup>1</sup>For several suggested original texts and a fuller discussion, see Scott, op. cit., pp. 148f.

## APPENDIX II

### THE INTERMEDIARY AGENTS IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The theological belief in a holy, transcendent God may have produced other theological changes in the thinking of the spiritual leaders of Judaism. The stress on the transcendence of God raised the problem of how God could contact man, especially since the former is holy and righteous and the latter, imperfect and unrighteous. Thus the theophany was spiritualized by the introduction of intermediaries<sup>1</sup> whose function was to act in a mediate position between God and man.

In the official religion of the Synagogue the embryonic intermediaries<sup>2</sup> of the Old Testament were developed and enlarged to include also the Metatron, the Holy Spirit, the Shekinah, the Bath Kol, the Messiah, and the Torah<sup>3</sup>. Although some of these are found highly developed in the Targum, the Greek translators apparently were little influenced by any desire to protect God in this manner. Hence, their use of intermediaries is very little advanced over that of the later books of the Old Testament.

#### 1. THE MESSIAH

The Messianic doctrine of the Greek Book of the Twelve

---

<sup>1</sup>See pages 3ff; cf. Eichrodt, op. cit., II, pp. 5-18.

<sup>2</sup>See pages 3ff.

<sup>3</sup>Oesterly and Box, op. cit., pp. 169-210.



remains essentially unchanged except for a slightly increased emphasis given by more frequent mention of the Messiah and the ascription to the Messiah of some of the minor functions which were formerly ascribed to God; for example:

(1) AMOS 4:13

יְהוָה-הוּא מְדַבֵּר וְיֹאמַר	. . . and declares to man what is his thought;
και απαγγελων εις αν- θρωπους τον χριστον αυτου <sup>1</sup>	. . . and proclaim for men his annointed one <sup>2</sup> (Messiah, Christ) --

Possibly the increased importance of the Messiah<sup>3</sup> may have led the translator to read יְהוָה-הוּא as יְהוָה(י)שׁוּעָה. If so, this translation may indicate a further stage in the development of the use of intermediaries.

(2) HABAKKUK 3:13

יְהוָה-הוּא יִשְׁלֶה	. . . for the salvation of thy annointed.
του σωσαι <sup>5</sup> τους χριστους <sup>6</sup> σου	. . . to save your annointed ones. <sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> α' = τις ομιλια αυτου ; σ' = το φωνημα αυτου ;  
θ' = τον λογον αυτου ; ε' = την αδολεσχιαν αυτον .

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint = יְהוָה or יְהוָה(י)שׁוּעָה (Harper, op. cit., p. 103).

<sup>3</sup>"(eene christelijke verandering zien wij hier niet)." (Stekhoven, op. cit., p. 114).

<sup>4</sup>The translator may have possessed a different text.

<sup>5</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 949, footnote) emends either to יְהוָה-הוּא or to יְהוָה-הוּא.

<sup>6</sup>W, Tert. III, 556.

<sup>7</sup>A literal translation.

This translation of a singular ( משיח ) by a plural ( τούς χριστους σου ) changes the application from the Messiah to the Israelite people. The text, here, is uncertain; some manuscripts<sup>1</sup> read a singular, τον χριστον . Therefore, no definite conclusion may be reached.

(3) ZECHARIAH 9:10

והכרתי-רכב  
מאפרים

I will cut off the chariot  
from Ephraim . . .

και εξολεθρευσει<sup>2</sup>  
αρματα εξ Εφραιμ

He will destroy chariots  
out of Ephraim . . .

The shift in person from the first, singular, to the third<sup>3</sup>, singular, changes the actor from God to the Messiah-King. Many commentators<sup>4</sup> consider that the correct text is והכרית ("and he will destroy"), following the Septuagint. Probably either the Septuagint indicates the original text, or else it reveals a theological change<sup>5</sup>.

Five passages are of especial interest to Christians because of an anti-Christian exegesis which may possibly be

<sup>1</sup>B<sup>4</sup>, B-S<sup>4</sup>, Ach Aeth<sup>P</sup>↓, οι λ<sup>1</sup>, ζ; cf. ε<sup>1</sup>, σ<sup>1</sup>, θ<sup>1</sup>, α<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>Procksch (op. cit., p. 966, footnote) emends to והכרית, following the Septuagint. Th<sup>lem</sup> = Masoretic Text.

<sup>3</sup>The Syriac also changes the person (Wright, op. cit., p. 571).

<sup>4</sup>For a partial list see Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 277.

<sup>5</sup>This alteration protects God by ascribing the action to the Messiah-King.

found in the Greek. Two<sup>1</sup> of these passages show little alteration and one<sup>2</sup> passage only in the plural.

(4) HOSEA 11:1

קראתי לבני	. . . I called my son.
μετεκαλεσα τα τεκνα <sup>3</sup> αυτου	. . . and I called his children . . .

This passage was quoted by early Christians<sup>4</sup> in support of the Messiahship of Jesus Christ. Certainly no Christian scribe would have altered τον υιον (τεκνον) μου<sup>5</sup> ("My son [child]") to τα τεκνα αυτου ("His children"). On the other hand an alteration of this type might have been made by a zealous Jew or proselyte to Judaism in the days of the violent Christian-Jewish controversey.

(5) ZECHARIAH 11:13

†  
השליכו אל-היוצר  
אדר היקר אשר יקרה  
סעליהם

'Cast it into the  
treasury' -- the lordly  
price at which I was  
paid off by them.  
valued.

R.S.V. translated  
based on an  
emended text -  
751/17.  
not very good  
here. Valued?

<sup>1</sup>Joel 3:1(2:28)f.

<sup>2</sup>Zechariah 13:7.

<sup>3</sup>Co, Aeth, Arm<sup>P</sup>, α', σ' = Masoretic Text.

<sup>4</sup>E.g., Matthew 2:15.

<sup>5</sup>The Syriac reads "my son" (so Harper, op. cit., p. 360).

καθεξ αυτους<sup>1</sup> εις το  
 χωνευτηριον και σχεψ-  
 ομαι ει δοκιμον εστιν ον  
 τροπον εδοκιμασθη<sup>2</sup> υπερ  
 αυτων<sup>3</sup>

Drop them into the  
 furnace, and I will see  
 if it is good metal, as  
 I was proved for their  
 sakes.<sup>4</sup>

This passage the early Christians<sup>5</sup> also understood to have a prophetic meaning which was fulfilled by Judas. Wellhausen<sup>6</sup> considers that Matthew 27:3f reflects a dual interpretation of this passage, and Jansma says, "G. had a badly written Hebrew text<sup>7</sup> possibly with some slight differences from M., conceived the sentence as dealing with a foundry . . . and rendered the difficult words accordingly."<sup>8</sup> Perhaps an anti-Christian Jewish scribe made some alterations here, following an already established interpretation, to make the passage somewhat less acceptable to the pro-Christian exegetes.

#### (6) ZECHARIAH 13:6

ואמר אשר הכיית  
 בית מאהבי

He will say, 'The wounds  
 which I received in the  
 house of my friends'.

<sup>1</sup> αυτο in Sa Syp Arm Epiph II 70 = Masoretic Text ↓.

<sup>2</sup> This verb usually translates יח (Jansma, op. cit., p. 106).

<sup>3</sup> α<sup>1</sup> = ριπον αυτο (s. αυτα ) προς τον πλαστην  
 υπερμεγεθης η τιμη ην ετιμηθην υπερ αυτων ; σ<sup>1</sup> =  
 ριπον αυτο εις το χωνευτηριον.

<sup>4</sup> Bagster, op. cit., p. 1123.

<sup>5</sup> See Matthew 27:9f.

<sup>6</sup> See Mitchell, Smith, Bower, op. cit., p. 314.

<sup>7</sup> So many commentators (loc. cit.).

<sup>8</sup> Jansma, op. cit., p. 106.

και ερει Ας επληγην εν  
τω οικω τω αγαπητω μου<sup>1</sup>

And he will say, those  
with which I was wounded  
in my beloved house?

The Septuagint may have understood מִנְהוּבָּ to be a pael passive participle, singular, with a first person singular suffix, as in the Aramaic<sup>2</sup>, or the translator (or editor) may have softened the Hebrew because of a pro-Israel (and/or anti-Christian) bias<sup>3</sup>.

(7) ZECHARIAH 13:7

In this passage certain manuscripts change the command παταξατε<sup>4</sup> τους ποιμενας<sup>5</sup> ("... smite the shepherds,"<sup>6</sup>) to παταξω<sup>7</sup> τον ποιμενα<sup>8</sup> ("I will smite the shepherd"), as Matthew<sup>9</sup> and Mark<sup>10</sup> also do. The Hebrew reads: הַךְ אֶת־הַרְעָה ("Strike the shepherd,") which both agrees and disagrees with

---

<sup>1</sup>So W; A<sup>1</sup> - 544 L 91 Co Arm Cyr<sup>F</sup> (= IV 680 V 560 X 216) Tht.P Hi. read του αγαπητου which is closer to the Masoretic Text.

<sup>2</sup>Jansma, op. cit., p. 125.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. "Those wherewith I was wounded in the house of them that made me to be beloved" (King, op. cit., p. 71).

<sup>4</sup>So W<sup>1</sup>B -S\* Co (vid.) Aeth Greg. Naz.

<sup>5</sup>So W<sup>1</sup>B -S\* Aeth Greg. Naz. Tert. (vid.) O.

<sup>6</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1125.

<sup>7</sup>So V-538 46-86C-711C 106 233<sup>1</sup> Arab Arm Cyr.P = Matthew 26:31; Mark 14:27.

<sup>8</sup>So rel (Barn. Iust. Eus. ecl.) = Matthew 26:31; Mark 14:27.

<sup>9</sup>26:31.

<sup>10</sup>14:27.



these Greek translations. Possibly the Masoretic Text and the Greek Manuscripts<sup>1</sup> which have παταξω for παταξατε were altered to protect the concept of God's character. Later perhaps these same Greek manuscripts were altered to τους ποιμενας for τον ποιμενα to avoid the Christian exegesis that "the shepherd" referred to Jesus Christ and His death. For a similar reason the τον ποιμενα<sup>2</sup> μου which occurred earlier in this verse was also changed to the plural<sup>3</sup>.

No definite conclusion, however, may be reached concerning the reason for the changes in Zechariah 13:7 or any of the other verses which vary from the early Christian exegesis.

The final changes<sup>4</sup> in translation which concern the Messianic era occur in Joel 2:11,31(3:4); Malachi 4:5(3:24). In these passages the Day of Yahweh is described as being

---

<sup>1</sup>W' B-S\* Co (vid.) Aeth Greg. Naz.

<sup>2</sup>So rel. (Iust. Eus. ecl.) = Masoretic Text.

<sup>3</sup>So W' B - S\* - V Q\* - 544 87<sup>c</sup> - 68 Ach Aeth Greg. Naz. I 473 Tert. fuga 11.

<sup>4</sup>Seeligmann, I. L. (The Septuagint Version of Isaiah A Discussion of Its Problems [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948], p. 28) considers that the translation of בקרב שנים חיים ("In the midst of years renew it; in the midst of years make it known,") in the Septuagint of Habakkuk 3:2 as εν μεσω δυο ζων γνωσθησθαι εν τω εγγιζειν τα ετη επιγνωσθησθαι εν τω παρειναι τον καιρον αναδειχθησθαι ("In the midst of two living beings thou wilt be known, when the years draw nigh thou wilt be acknowledged; when the time is come thou wilt be pointed out;") is reminiscent of the story of Jesus' birth in the manger between the ox and the ass. He refers in particular to the Protevangelium Jacobi and Evangelium pseudo Matthaei 22.



'terrible' (אָרִי); the Septuagint translates this word as 'manifest' (επιφανης). This change is especially interesting because in every instance in the Minor Prophets, in which the niphal participle (אָרִי) of אָרַ" (to be afraid) occurs, the Greek equivalent is always επιφανης<sup>1</sup> ("manifest"), e.g., Malachi 1:14:<sup>2</sup>

וְשֵׁםִי נִרְאָה בְּגוֹיִם

. . . and my name is  
feared among the nations.

καὶ τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπι-  
φανὲς ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

. . . and my name is  
illustrious among the  
nations,

Therefore, the translator may have been softening the Hebrew idea, or he may have considered the root of נִרְאָה to be אָרַ" ("to see"). This problem has been discussed already<sup>3</sup>.

## 2. THE TORAH

Another intermediary which was of great importance in later Judaism is the Law or Torah (תּוֹרָה). The concept of the Torah as an intermediary device shows little<sup>4</sup> if any advance. In fact, Dr. Sheldon H. Blank considers that in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Or a form of the corresponding verb; cf. Zephaniah 2:11 -- depending on the Greek codex.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. also Habakkuk 1:7.

<sup>3</sup>See pages 143ff.

<sup>4</sup>According to Östborn, Gunnar (Tōrā In The Old Testament: A Semantic Study [Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1945], pp. 172-178) the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion -- all apparently interpreted תּוֹרָה as law and not teaching.

Septuagint there are fewer references to חור than in the Masoretic Text. He concludes that "... these terms [חור and חסון<sup>1</sup>] were being added as glosses by Hebrew Scribes at a late date"<sup>2</sup>. There are several passages of interest:

(1) AMOS 4:5

וקטר מחמץ חודה

... offer a sacrifice  
of thanksgiving of that  
which is leavened,

και ανεγνωσαν εξω  
νομον<sup>3</sup>

... for having publicly  
read a law ...

Probably the translator read an ך instead of a ך in this passage.

(2) HOSEA 8:12

אכתוב-לו רב  
חורתי כמו-זר  
נחשבו

Were I to write for him  
my laws by ten thousands,  
they would be regarded as  
a strange thing.

καταγραψω αυτω  
πληθος και τα  
νομιμα<sup>4</sup> αυτου ως  
αλλοτρια ελογισθη-  
σαν

I will prescribe for him  
a multitude. Though his  
rites were devised for  
other purposes,

<sup>1</sup>"judgement"

<sup>2</sup>Blank, Sheldon H., "The Septuagint Renderings of Old Testament Terms for Law", Hebrew Union College Annual, VII (1930), p. 281f.

<sup>3</sup>α' = ευχαριστιαν.

<sup>4</sup>"The use of νομιμον ["conformable to custom, usage, or law"; "observant of law"; "customs"; etc.] to render חור ["teaching, law"] is with one exception confined to the portions of the Bible in which νομιμον is used to render חר-ח ["statute, law"], the Pentateuch, Jeremiah, Ezek. and the Book of the Twelve ... (Blank, op. cit., p. 278).

The Septuagint here probably represents a different ~~xxx~~ <sup>for</sup> or misread Hebrew Text in which the  $\text{ב}$  of  $\text{רבּו}$  ("by ten thousands") was doubled and the  $\text{י}$  of  $\text{חורתי}$  ("my laws") was read as a  $\text{י}$ .

These two passages cannot establish that the Torah ( $\text{חורָה}$ ) was used by the translator as an intermediary device. The instances are probably examples of misread or different texts.

### 3. THE HOLY SPIRIT

The Holy Spirit is another intermediary in which the Septuagint may show development. In the Hebrew only one word,  $\text{רוּחַ}$  ("spirit"), is used in the Minor Prophets, to denote spirit. This word, when it means wind, is translated three times<sup>1</sup> in the Greek Twelve by  $\alpha\epsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$  ("wind") and five times<sup>2</sup> by  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  ("spirit, wind"). In the remaining five occurrences of  $\text{רוּחַ}$  ("spirit, wind"), it denotes either the spirit of man<sup>3</sup> or of God<sup>4</sup> and is translated by  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  ("spirit") or  $\theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Hosea 13:15; Zechariah 2:6(10); 6:5.

<sup>2</sup>Hosea 4:19; 12:2(1); Amos 4:13; Micah 2:11(?); Zechariah 5:9.

<sup>3</sup>Habakkuk 1:11; Haggai 1:14(three times); Zechariah 12:1; Malachi 2:15,16.

<sup>4</sup>Joel 3:1(2:28)f; Micah 2:7; 3:8; Haggai 2:5; Zechariah 4:6; 6:8; 7:12; cf. 12:10.

<sup>5</sup>Zechariah 6:8.

("wrath"). Thus, there is no consistent lexical translation with reference to רוּחַ<sup>1</sup> ("spirit, wind").

Certain passages, however, relating to God's Spirit in either the Septuagint or the Masoretic Text should be considered.

(1) ZECHARIAH 6:8

הֵנִיחוּ אֶת־רוּחִי

(. . . those . . .) have  
set my Spirit at rest . . .

ἀνεπαύσαν τον θυμόν<sup>2</sup>  
μου

(. . . they . . .) have  
appeased my wrath . . .<sup>3</sup>

The word, רוּחַ ("spirit"), may have been used here in the sense of 'wrath'<sup>4</sup>, or the translator may have been offended at the statement of the Hebrew. Therefore, he may have softened it by his translation. In the only other passage<sup>5</sup>, in which רוּחַ ("spirit") is God's spirit, the Greek translation is literal.

(2) ZECHARIAH 1:6

---

<sup>1</sup>See also Hosea 4:12; 5:4; Habakkuk 2:19; Zechariah 13:2; Malachi 2:15a, where רוּחַ also is translated πνεύμα in the Septuagint; cf. Hosea 8:7 and 9:7.

<sup>2</sup>τ. θορυβόν (68); το πνεύμα (Bo Tht O = Masoretic Text).

<sup>3</sup>The Targum translates רוּחִי by רְעוּתִי ("my will, pleasure"); see page 205.

<sup>4</sup>So Lowe, *op. cit.*, p. 59. See also Judges 8:13; cf. Ezekiel 5:12; 16:42; 24:13.

<sup>5</sup>Micah 2:7 Masoretic Text = בֵּית יַעֲקֹב (הַקֶּצֶר רוּחַ) ("O house of Jacob? Is the Spirit of the Lord impatient?").  
Micah 2:7 Septuagint = Οἶκος Ιακώβ παρωργίσε πνεύμα  
("The house of Israel [Jacob] hath provoked to wrath the spirit of the Lord.").

וְהָאֵלֹהִים צִוְּיָהּ  
עַבְדֵי הַנְּבִיאִים

. . . which I commanded  
my servants the prophets  
. . .

ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντελλομαι  
ἐν πνεύματι μου τοῖς  
δουλοῖς μου τοῖς προ-  
φηταῖς

. . . all that I, by my  
spirit, give in charge  
to my servants the  
prophets,

This addition of ἐν πνεύματι μου (= בְּרוּחִי, "by My Spirit") may follow the example of the Hebrew in Zechariah 7:12<sup>1</sup>, or it may reflect the increased importance of God's Spirit.

#### 4. OTHER INTERMEDIARIES

Two other intermediaries of later Judaism should be mentioned briefly: The Glory and the Word (Logos). There are two passages in which the Septuagint translation involving these concepts is interesting.

##### (1) MICAH 2:9

וְהָאֵלֹהִים צִוְּיָהּ  
עַבְדֵי הַנְּבִיאִים

. . . from their young  
children you take away  
my glory forever.

δια τα πονηρα επι-  
τηδευματα αυτων εξ-  
ωσθησαν εγγισατε  
ορεσιν αιωνιοις

. . . for their evil  
devices they have been  
expelled; draw ye near to  
the everlasting mountains.

The Syriac and the Targum both avoid the idea that God's Glory could be removed. Perhaps this desire to protect his concept of Deity (and of God's Glory) induced the Greek

<sup>1</sup>So Lowe, op. cit., p. 9.



translator to alter his translation; his zeal, coupled with a slightly different text (or a misread text), would easily account for this translation<sup>1</sup>.

(2) HABAKKUK 3:5

לפניו ילך דבר

Before him went  
pestilence,

προ προσωπου αυτου  
πορευσεται λογος<sup>3</sup>

Before him Logos<sup>2</sup> (the  
word) will march,

The translation of דבר ("pestilence") as λογος ("Logos, word") involves only a change of vocalization of the Hebrew consonants. Such a vocalization change could easily arise from the increased importance of "Word" in the mind of the translator. Possibly a  
mere mistake

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 63f; et al.

<sup>2</sup>α' = pestis; σ' = ε' = mors.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Amos 4:13 where Theodotion translates ("what is his [God's] thought") as τον λογον αυτου ("his word"). See page 366.

הוא-הוא  
("his")



### APPENDIX III

#### THE ATTITUDE OF THE GREEK TRANSLATOR TOWARDS THE HEATHEN AND THE FORMER KINGDOMS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH

While this attitude of the translator, strictly speaking, may not be a theological concept, yet this attitude stemmed in part from his zeal for God. Therefore, because of his zeal for God and because of the intimate connection of the heathen and the kingdoms of Israel and Judah with eschatology, this subject may be considered appropriately here.

##### 1. ANTI-HEATHEN EXEGESIS

The intense hatred of the translator for the heathen may be reflected in his translations. Perhaps this hatred may be observed in the intensification of his translations of single words and short phrases, e.g., και εξημαρτεν η ψυχη σου ("... and thy soul hath sinned [greatly];") for נפשוך ("... you have forfeited your life."), διαταξη εθνων ("... nations melted away;") for ויחר גוים ("... and shook the nations;")<sup>2</sup><sup>3</sup>, et al. Of a similar nature are the following lexical variations: οι καταφρονηται<sup>4</sup> ("... X

<sup>1</sup>Habakkuk 2:10; the Septuagint is the equivalent either to נחשט (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 948 footnote) or to נחשט (so Smith, Ward, Bower, op. cit., p. 18).

<sup>2</sup>or "and caused nations to start up." (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 231).

<sup>3</sup>Habakkuk 3:6.

<sup>4</sup>This involves only the substitution of a ך for a ך (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 165; Wutz, op. cit., p. 201; Smith, Ward, Bower, op. cit., p. 10; cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 946, footnote ם״ב״ו״ו״).

despisers!") for בְּנוֹיִם ("... among the nations,") in Habakkuk 1:5 and και το λημμα<sup>1</sup> ("and his gain"<sup>2</sup>) for וְשֹׂאֵהוּ ("... and dignity...") in Habakkuk 1:7<sup>3</sup>.

(1) The translator's dislike of the heathen is also found in the increased punishment that is given the nations who fail to go up to Jerusalem to the feast of Tabernacles in the Messianic Age. It is no longer the lack of rain (or in Egypt's case, the overflow of the Nile), but the punishment of Zechariah 14:12. Thus the appropriate portions of 17f., וְלֹא עָלֵיהֶם יְהוּחַ חֲנָשׁ . . . וְלֹא עָלֵיהֶם חֶהָהּ . . . ("... there will be no rain upon them . . . upon them shall not<sup>4</sup> come the plague with which the Lord afflicts the nations . . .") are translated as και ουτοι εκεινοις προστεθησονται<sup>5</sup> . . . και<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>"an etymological rendering" (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 169).

<sup>2</sup>Or burden; a free translation.

<sup>3</sup>A softening?; cf. σ' = δογματι.

<sup>4</sup>Following the Revised Standard Version footnote γ, p. 994.

<sup>5</sup>και ουκ εσται επ αυτους υετος (W<sup>1</sup> L<sup>1</sup> -613-770 87<sup>C</sup>-68 Tht = Masoretic Text; cf. α', σ', θ'. Kähler (so Lowe, op. cit., p. 129) and Wright, C.H.H. (op. cit., p. 508 footnote 1) consider that the Septuagint read וְאֵלֶּה עָלֵיהֶם נֶשֶׁם יְהוָה. Lowe (op. cit., p. 129) considers that the translator read וְאֵלֶּה עָלֵיהֶם יְהוּחַ חֲנָשׁ ("and to them shall be the-making-to-approach-of-the-others" -- loc. cit.) as in late Hebrew; cf. Jansma, op. cit., p. 139.

<sup>6</sup>The Septuagint omits the ל of the Hebrew; six Hebrew manuscripts omit ל or וְלֹא, (Wright, C.H.H., op. cit., p. 508, footnote 1; Treitel, op. cit., p. 234).

ἐπὶ τοῦτοις <sup>1</sup> ἔσται ἡ πῶσις <sup>2</sup> ἣν παταξει κύριος πάντα  
 τὰ ἔθνη ("... even they shall be added to those... upon  
 them shall be the plague with which the Lord will smite all  
 the nations...").

(2) Likewise this anti-heathen feeling may be observed  
 in the denunciation of the heathen for their treatment of  
 Israel. The Septuagint describes their treatment of Israel as  
 action against God Himself, e.g., Zephaniah 2:10 לִי וְיִגְדִּילֵם כִּי

נִבְאָהוּ בְּיָמֵי הַלֵּל ("... because they scoffed and  
 boasted against the people of the Lord of Hosts") becomes  
 διότι ὠνειδίσαν καὶ ἐμεγάλυνθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον τὸν παντοκράτορα  
 παντοκράτορα<sup>4</sup> ("... because they have reproached and  
 magnified themselves against the Lord Almighty"<sup>5</sup>); cf. Malachi  
 1:4.

(3) This feeling of antagonism to the heathen may be  
 seen in statements, such as, the alteration of זָרִים ("...  
 the arrogant..."), in Malachi 3:19(4:1), which refers to the

<sup>1</sup>Procksch, (op. cit., p. 972, footnote) emends with the  
 Septuagint and Syriac to מְלִיץ.

<sup>2</sup>πληγή (W<sup>c</sup>(?) L<sup>v</sup>-407<sup>mg</sup> -613-770<sup>c</sup>).

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint B.S.A.Q., Aquila, Syriac<sup>H</sup>, HP., 48,  
 153, 233 omit (so Smith, Ward, Bower, op. cit., p. 231).

<sup>4</sup>"συκάνν aus der Vorlage der LXX versehentlich  
 ausgefallen sein (Haplographie nach γ). Wahrscheinlich  
 steckt aber in der griechischen Übersetzung eine bewusste  
 Tendenz, zumal da sie denselben Gedanken ausdrückt wie in  
 2,8:" (Gerleman, op. cit., p. 39).

<sup>5</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1110.

Jewish people, to *οι αλλογενεις*<sup>1</sup> ("... the aliens ..."), and also in the intensification of *על-דושם בחרצות הברדל*

*גלגל-נהם* ("... because they have threshed Gilead with threshing sledges of iron."), in Amos 1:3, by translating it as *ανθων επιρζον<sup>2</sup> πριοςι σιδηροις τας εν γαστρι εχουσας των εν Γαλααδ<sup>3</sup>* ("Because with iron saws they have sawed asunder the pregnant wives of the men of Gilead;"). The additional words found in the Greek translation may be an insertion from 1:13<sup>4</sup>. Moreover, the hatred of the heathen (probably the Samaritans<sup>5</sup>) may also be observed in Amos 6:1 where the prophet links a warning to Judah and Israel together, but the translator changes it to those who hate Zion, etc.:

וְהוֹי שְׂאֵנִים בְּצִיּוֹן  
וְהַבְטָחִים בְּהַר  
שֶׁמֶר

Woe to those who are at ease in Zion, and to those who feel secure on the mountain of Samaria,

Ουαι τοις εξουθενουσι  
Σιων<sup>6</sup> και τοις πεποιθοσιν  
επι το ορος Σαμαρειας

Alas for them who despise Sion and have put their trust in the mount of Samaria.

<sup>1</sup> α<sup>1</sup> = υπερηφανοι ; the Septuagint requires only the misreading of α<sup>1</sup> as α<sup>2</sup> (cf. Mitchell, Smith, Bower, *op. cit.*, p. 84).

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint = *ορις* (?) (so Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 13).

<sup>3</sup> σ<sup>1</sup> = ανθων ηλοησαν τροχοις σιδηροις (α<sup>1</sup> = ηλωων εν τροχοις (η τριβολοις)); θ<sup>1</sup> = αξοσι την γαλααδ.

<sup>4</sup>So Vollers (*op. cit.*, I, p. 260; Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 14) and Harper (*loc. cit.*). These additional words are not supported by the other versions.

<sup>5</sup>"LXX and Pesh., which have 'those who despise Zion', doubtless intend a paraphrase for Samaria;" (Grippe, *op. cit.*, p. 202).

<sup>6</sup> θ<sup>1</sup> (Iust.) = κατασπαταλωντες σιων ; α<sup>1</sup> = ουαι οι ευθηνουντες εν σιων.



This translation may reflect an anti-Northern Kingdom bias, but it is just as likely directed against the later Samaritans.

## 2. THE PRO-ISRAEL EXEGESIS

Unlike the Greek Book of Kings<sup>1</sup>, the Greek Minor Prophets do not seem to exhibit any unforgiving attitude towards the Northern Kingdom. On the contrary, for both Ephraim (Israel) and Judah the Septuagint shows a most favorable attitude. These alterations may be classified as follows:

### (1) SOFTENING OF STATEMENTS UNFAVORABLE TO ISRAEL:

#### [1] HOSEA 1:4

והשבתי ממלכות ב"ח  
ישראל

\* \* \* and I will put an  
end the kingdom of the  
house of Israel.

και αποστρεψω<sup>2</sup>  
βασιλειαν οικου  
ισραηλ

\* \* \* and [I will] cause  
the kingdom of the house  
of Israel to cease.

#### [2] HOSEA 4:6

נדמו עמי מבלי<sup>3</sup>  
הדעה

My people are destroyed  
for the lack of knowl-  
edge;

<sup>1</sup>Wevers, J.W., "Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of I Kings ii 12-xxi 43", Oudtestamentische Studien Deel VIII (1950), p. 321.

<sup>2</sup>καταπαυσω (rel.) = Masoretic Text; also οί.ο'.

<sup>3</sup>See page 146 for a discussion of this verb.

αμοιωθη<sup>1</sup> ο λαος μου  
ως ουκ εχων γνωσιν<sup>2</sup>

. . . my people is like  
one that hath not knowl-  
edge:

*Prob. case of  
other text or  
mistaken transl.*

[3] HOSEA 4:15

אם-תִּנָּה<sup>4</sup> אהה ישראל<sup>3</sup>  
אל-אשם יהודה<sup>5</sup>

Though you play the  
harlot, O Israel, let  
not Judah become guilty.

Συ δε Ισραηλ μη  
αγνοει και Ιουδα

As for thee, Israel,  
continue not in ignorance;  
and thou Judah . . .

[4] HOSEA 4:16

כי כפרה סררה  
סרר ישראל

Like a stubborn heifer,  
Israel is stubborn;

οτι ως δαμαλις παροιστρωσα  
παροιστρησεν Ισραηλ

For Israel was maddened  
like a mad heifer:<sup>6</sup>

[5] HOSEA 4:17

הנה לו

. . . let him alone.

<sup>1</sup>Procksch (*op. cit.*, p. 898 footnote), emends to נדמה following the Septuagint and Syriac. Harper (*op. cit.*, p. 253) considers the Septuagint to be the equivalent of דמ'ה' (passive).

<sup>2</sup> α' = εσιωπησε λαος μοι οτι ουκ εχει γνωσιν; σ' = επιμωθη;  
θ' = εσιωπησεν.

<sup>3</sup>The Septuagint connects אם-תִּנָּה with verse 14.

<sup>4</sup>The Septuagint = אהה ישראל אל חשן (so Nyberg, *op. cit.*, p. 30).

<sup>5</sup>The Septuagint = לא חאשם (Harper, *op. cit.*, p. 262; Ruben, *op. cit.*, p. 10).

<sup>6</sup>Bagster, *op. cit.*, p. 1073.



εθηκεν εαυτω  
σκανδαλα<sup>1</sup>

\* \* \* (Ephraim) laid  
stumbling-blocks for  
himself.

[6] HOSEA 10:13

עֲשִׂיתָ עֲוֹן

You have plowed iniquity,

ινα τι παρεσιωπησατε<sup>2</sup>  
ασεβειαν

Why have you concealed  
impiety. . .

[7] MICAH 4:11

הִנָּהּ

Let her be profaned,

Επιχαρουμεθα<sup>3</sup>

Let us rejoice  
exceedingly . . .<sup>4</sup>

[8] MALACHI 2:11<sup>5</sup>

בְּנִדָּה יִהְיֶה  
וּבְעַל בַּת-אֲלֹהִים זָרִים

Judah has been faithless,  
. . . and has married the  
daughter of a foreign god.

---

<sup>1</sup> σκανδαλα = נִיִּן (Rueben, op. cit., p. 11); ". . . perhaps G represents some word which has been lost;" (Harper, op. cit., p. 262).

<sup>2</sup> εσπειρατε 86<sup>MS</sup> Ach Aeth<sup>P</sup> Ambr II 100; the Septuagint = "עֲשִׂיתָ עֲוֹן", natürlich undenkbar" (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 81).

<sup>3</sup> επιχαρωμεθα 1 I; α ' = incidit in furorem; σ ' = κατακριθησεται.

<sup>4</sup>Rysell considers the Septuagint to be free translation; cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 105f.

<sup>5</sup>See also Zephaniah 3:15, page 57, footnote 4.

εγκατελειφθη<sup>1</sup> Ιουδας  
...και επετηδευσεν  
εις θεους αλλοτριους<sup>2</sup>

Juda has been forsaken,  
... and has gone after  
other gods.<sup>3</sup>

Bewer<sup>4</sup> considers that the Septuagint has paraphrased freely, perhaps in order to avoid the mentioning of marriage with foreigners.

[9] ZEPHANIAH 3:2(1)

וְהָיָה כְּהָרִיב  
וְהָיָה כְּהָרִיב

Woe to her that is  
rebellious and defiled,  
the oppressing city!

Ω η επιφανης και  
απολελυτρωμενη  
η πολις η περιστερα  
ουκ εισηκουσε φωνης

Oh! the illustrious and  
redeemed city! This dove  
(hearkened not to a voice.) *Prob. just a  
blunder.  
beginning of  
next sentence.*

[10] HOSEA 14:5(4)

אֶפְרַיִם אֶפְרַיִם

I will heal their faith-  
lessness;

יִשְׁמְרוּן  
יִשְׁמְרוּן

I will heal their  
habitations.

*Prob. just a  
blunder.*

(2) SOFTENING OF STATEMENTS REGARDING ISRAEL'S  
EVIL ATTITUDE TOWARDS GOD:

[1] HOSEA 5:7

<sup>1</sup> ηθετησεν Ach = Masoretic Text; cf. also α' =  
ηθετησεν.

<sup>2</sup> α' = και εσχε θυγατερα θεου απηλλοτριωμενου;  
σ' = και εσχε την θυγατερα θεου αππαλλοτριωσεως;  
θ' = και ελαβε την θυγατερα ηλ ξενου.

<sup>3</sup> Bagster, op. cit., p. 1128.

<sup>4</sup> Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 58.

בִּיהוּה<sup>1</sup> בָּנְדוּThey have dealt faith-  
lessly with the Lord;οτι τον κυριον εγ-  
κατελιπονBecause they have for-  
saken the Lord,[2] HOSEA 7:14(15)<sup>2</sup>

יִסְרוּ בִי

. . . they rebel against  
me.Επαιδευθησαν εν  
εμοιBy me they were instructed  
---[3] HOSEA 13:9<sup>3</sup>שִׁחַתְךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי-  
בִי בַעֲזָרְךָ<sup>4</sup>It is thy destruction, O  
Israel, That thou art  
against Me, against thy  
help.<sup>5</sup>τη διαφθορα σου  
Ισραηλ τις βοηθησειIn thy destruction, O  
Israel, who can give  
succour?(3) THE ASCRIPTION TO ISRAEL OF STATEMENTS  
WHICH REFER IN THE HEBREW TO GOD

## [1] HOSEA 11:12(12:1)

ועם-קדושים נאמן

. . . and is faithful to  
the Holy One[s].<sup>1</sup>For a fuller discussion see pages 103f.<sup>2</sup>See pages 100f.<sup>3</sup>See pages 100f.<sup>4</sup>Procksch, *ibid.*, p. 909 footnote, emends with the  
Septuagint and Syriac to מִי בַעֲזָרְךָ.<sup>5</sup>American Jewish Translation.

και λαος αγιος κε-  
κλησεται θεου<sup>1</sup>

. . . and they were to  
be called the holy  
people of God --

[2] ZECHARIAH 9:11

יְהוָה יִפְתֹּחַ  
לָּנוּ מִבְּיָר

I will set your captives  
free from the (waterless) pit. *Heb. words  
not quoted!*

εξαπεστειλας<sup>2</sup> δεσμιους  
σου εκ λακκου

(thou)<sup>3</sup>. . . hast sent  
forth thy prisoners out  
of a pit (which hath no  
water.) *Heb. words not  
quoted!*

[3] MICAH 4:2

וְיִרְנֶנּוּ מִדְּרָכָיו

. . . that he may teach  
us his ways . . .

και δειξουσιν ημιν<sup>4</sup>  
την οδον αυτου

. . . that they may point  
out to us his ways. . .

(4) STATEMENTS UNFAVORABLE TO ISRAEL IN THEIR  
RELATIONSHIP WITH THE HEATHEN WHICH ARE  
REVERSED (OR SOFTENED) IN THE GREEK:

[1] HOSEA 5:11

<sup>1</sup>The Syriac (and Septuagint?) = *עם קדוש ומאמי* (so Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 907, footnote). The Septuagint = *עם קדוש ואמר* [לא] (so Vollers [*op. cit.*, I, p. 256] and Harper [*op. cit.*, p. 374]). Nyberg (*op. cit.*, p. 91) considers that the Septuagint corresponds to *עם קדוש ואמר*.

<sup>2</sup>538 - *εξαπεστειλα* ; Aeth. = Masoretic Text.

<sup>3</sup>The context favors the first person (Wright, C.H.H., *op. cit.*, p. 571).

<sup>4</sup>*φωτιουσιν ημας* (Iust.); the Septuagint may have read *וְיִרְנֶנּוּ* (Taylor, *op. cit.*, p. 93).

עשוק אפרים רצון  
משפט כי הוא יל' הלך  
אחרי-צו

Ephraim is oppressed,  
crushed in judgment,  
because he was determined  
to go after vanity.<sup>1</sup>

κατεδυναστευσεν  
Εφραιμ τον αντιδικον  
αυτου κατεπατησε  
κριμα οτι ηρξατα πο-  
ρευεσθαι οπισω των  
ματαιων<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Ephraim tyrannized over  
his adversary, he trampled  
down judgement; because he  
set the example of going  
after vanities,

[2] HOSEA 8:3

אויב ירדפו

. . . the enemy shall  
pursue him (Israel).

εχθρον κατεδιωξαν<sup>4</sup>

. . . they have pursued  
an enemy.<sup>5</sup>

This translation requires only a change in vocalization.<sup>6</sup>

(5) MESSIANIC VARIATIONS

The Septuagint teaches that the Lord will bring back  
all the exiles and recompense them for their time of exile:

[1] ZECHARIAH 9:12

<sup>1</sup>Revised Standard Version, footnote s (p. 939) reads  
"a command".

<sup>2</sup> κατεδυναστευσεν = פָּרַע (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 38).

<sup>3</sup>אויב; cf. the Targum and Syriac (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 900 footnote).

<sup>4</sup> εχθρος κατεδιωξεν αυτον -- V Arm; cf. οι λ'

<sup>5</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1075.

<sup>6</sup>So Nyberg (op. cit., p. 62) who adds, ". . . was mir  
das Richtige zu treffen scheint."; cf. Harper (op. cit., p.  
301).



גַּם-הַיּוֹם כִּנִּיךְ מִשְׁנָה  
אֲשִׁיב לְךָ

. . . today I declare  
that I will restore to  
you double.

και αντι μιας ημερας  
παροικεσιας σου διπλα  
ανταποδωσω σοι

. . . and for thy one  
day's sojourning I will  
make thee twofold  
compensations.<sup>1</sup>

[2] ZECHARIAH 10:10

וְלֹא יִמָּצֵא לָהֶם

. . . till there is no  
room for them.

και ου μη υπολειφθη  
εξ αυτων ουδε εις

. . . and there shall not  
even one of them be left  
behind [in exile, that is].<sup>2</sup>

Secondly, the idea that they pierced the Messiah is  
softened slightly in Zechariah 12:10:

וְהָבִיטוּ אֵלַי  
אֲשֶׁר-דָּרָקוּ

. . . so that, when they  
will look on me<sup>3</sup> whom they  
have pierced,

και επιβλεψονται  
προς με ανθ' ων  
κατωρχησαντο<sup>4</sup>

. . . and they shall look  
upon me, because they  
have mocked me,<sup>5</sup>

Finally, the Greek translation apparently teaches the  
existence of a Saviour in Joel 3:5(2:32) where וְיִרְשָׁלַם חַיָּה

<sup>1</sup>See pages 63f.

<sup>2</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1122.

<sup>3</sup>Following Revised Standard Version, footnote s, p. 992.

<sup>4</sup>Perhaps he read דָּרָקוּ ("leap") as one of Kennicott's (op. cit., p. 300) manuscripts, or he interpreted דָּרָקוּ figuratively (Lowe, op. cit., p. 111).

<sup>5</sup>Bagster, op. cit., p. 1124.



פליט ("... and in Jerusalem there shall be those who escape,") is rendered as και εν Ιερουσαλημ εσται ανασωζομενος <sup>1</sup> ("... and in Jerusalem shall be the Saviour,").

(6) STATEMENTS IN THE SEPTUAGINT WHICH ARE  
BOASTFUL OF ISRAEL

AMOS 5:15

שנאו-רע ואהבו טוב

Hate evil, and love  
good,

Μεμισηκαμεν τα  
πονηρα και ηγαπηκα-  
μεν τα καλα

We have hated evil and  
loved good;

This translation changes a command into an exaltation of Israel.

3. GREEK TRANSLATIONS WHICH FAVOR THE HEATHEN AND  
ARE UNFAVORABLE TO ISRAEL

Sometimes the Septuagint is less favorable to Israel than the Masoretic Text. This situation may exist, e.g., in Hosea 2:17(15) where και ταπεινωθησεται <sup>2</sup> ("... and she shall be humbled. . .") translates ηννη ("And[there] she will answer. . ."); in Amos 9:12 where the idea of the remnant of Edom being possessed (שׂר - hiphil) by Israel is altered so that the remnant of men and the heathen (εχζητησωσιν) seek God (presumably); and finally, in Zechariah

<sup>1</sup> σ' = qui fugerit = ο εκφευγων.

<sup>2</sup>The Septuagint took the root of ηννη to be root III, "to be low, humble".

2:15(11) where the picture of God dwelling in the midst of Israel is changed to that of the heathen<sup>1</sup> dwelling in Israel's midst.

---

<sup>1</sup>Here the Septuagint is more favorable to the heathen than the Masoretic Text.

## APPENDIX IV

### CULTIC PROTECTION

The fact that the Targum of Jonathan was read in public worship, and probably was produced primarily for the more uneducated listeners (and readers?), produced certain changes of a more lexical nature designed to safeguard the targumist's concept of Deity and of the reverence which should be shown in His worship. These changes<sup>1</sup> which were introduced in the Targum are noted in connection with the use of אלהים (אלהא in the Targum), the words designating idols, priests (true and false), prophets (true and false), justice (of God or man), etc.<sup>2</sup>, and thus may be thought of as attempts to safeguard the reverence due the cultus. Therefore, they may be considered under the heading, cultic protection.

#### 1. THE USE OF אלהים

The Masoretic Text applies אלהים to both God and idols, but in the Targum the use of אלהא<sup>3</sup> is restricted to

---

<sup>1</sup>"The targumist made it a principle to differentiate between the holy and the profane. Words which are equally applied to the holy and the unholy are rendered by the targumist by distinct words to maintain the difference. The Masorites followed a similar way. So that when ״ is followed by the name of God it is vocalized with a patach . . . While followed by a profane it is vocalized with a zeire." (Churgin, op. cit., p. 111).

<sup>2</sup>For an example of the desire to defend the Mosaic law of divorce, see Malachi 2:16 (page 247.)

<sup>3</sup>Note that the Targum, with one or two possible exceptions, always translates the plural אלהים by the singular אלהא.

God alone. Usually whenever אלהים ("gods"), אל ("god"), or אלוה ("god") refer to idols, the targumist translates them by טעוהא ("idols"), e.g., Hosea 3:1; Amos 2:8; Micah 4:5; Nahum 1:14; Habakkuk 1:11<sup>1</sup>.

Moreover, in Hosea 3:1 the targumist avoids any imputation of deity to these idols by translating אליהם אחריים ("other gods") as טעוה עממא ("idols of the nations"). Possibly this motive explains the additional remarks that the targumist adds in Hosea 8:6 (דליה ביה צרוד, "the unuseful one"<sup>3</sup>) and in Jonah 1:5 (וחזו ארי ליה בהון צרוד, "when [and] they saw that there was no usefulness in them.").

Likewise, the targumist usually avoids the use of בעל ("Baal"). Thus, for example, in Hosea 2:10(3), 15(13), 18(16)<sup>4</sup>, 19(17); 11:2; 13:1, the targumist substitutes טעוהא

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Hosea 14:4 where אלהא ("god") is retained. The context here, however, favors the retention because in this passage it is predicated that Israel will cease to call idols her gods. Note, however, that the targumist still translates the plural by a singular. Another interesting passage occurs in Zephaniah 1:8: וועל כל-אלבשים מלבוש זכרי ("... and all who array themselves in foreign attire."). The targumist in his translation strikes at the religious implication of these acts of assimilation: וועל כל דמחרנשין למיפלה לטעוהא ("and all who are excited to worship idols"). Similarly the Targum renders ובעל בת-אל זכר ("... and has married the daughter of a foreign god.") in Malachi 2:11 as ואיתרעיאן ("... and they desired to receive for themselves as wives the daughters of the heathen.").

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Churgin, *op. cit.*, p. 112 for other examples of this.

<sup>3</sup>*Loc. cit.*

<sup>4</sup>See page 200.

("idols") for בעלים ("Baalim"). In Zephaniah 1:4 and Joel 1:8 it is retained, and in Nahum 1:2 it is omitted. In a few passages, e.g., Amos 9:4, expressions like קדם בעלי דבניהון ("before the Baalim [masters] of their opponents") occur.

In a few passages the targumist uses דחלחא ("fear") to translate אלהים ("God"). Concerning these passages Churgin states that "... the targumist is anxious to avoid even an innocent profanation ... On the other hand, when this profane אלהים is not employed in the sense of incrimination but as a fact the rendering is דחלחא 'fear'.<sup>1</sup> He cites as an example Jonah 1:5<sup>2</sup>. To this example may be added also Hosea 8:6<sup>3</sup>; Amos 8:14; Zephaniah 2:11; and the unique translation in Habakkuk 2:20 of הם מפניו כל-הארץ ("... let all the earth keep silence before him") as ויסופון מן קדמוהי כל דחלחא ארעא ("... and every idol of the earth will cease before Him").

Finally, the translation of אלהים ("gods") in Amos 5:26 should be noted. Here סעווחא ("idols") occurs in the Targum just a few words preceding the occurrence of אלהים in the Hebrew text. Perhaps this fact may account for the single occurrence in the Targum of the Twelve of צלמי כון

<sup>1</sup>Churgin, op. cit., p. 112.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 113.

<sup>3</sup> דחלחא.



("your images") as a rendering of אלהים<sup>1</sup> ("gods").

## 2. THE USE OF מזבח ("ALTAR")

The targumist makes a clear distinction between the altars of God and the idolatrous idols. The altars of God he translates by the Aramaic equivalent מרבחא<sup>2</sup>, and he translates, the profane, idolatrous altars as אנורא<sup>3</sup> ("the pile"). The word, מזבח ("altar"), suggests the concept of sacrifices and the act of sacrificing.

The verb, זבח ("to sacrifice"), is not rendered consistently. In Hosea 4:13; 8:13; 11:2; 12:12(11); 13:2; Jonah 1:16; Habakkuk 1:16; Zechariah 14:21; Malachi 1:8, and 14 the verb is translated by the Aramaic equivalent רבח even though people are sacrificing to God or to idols (e.g., Habakkuk 1:16). In the Targum of Hosea 4:14 the idea of sacrificing is eliminated. In the remaining passages זבח is translated by קרב<sup>4</sup>.

In like manner the targumist usually translates זבח ("sacrifice") by the Aramaic equivalent רבח. In Zephaniah 1:7,8, however, a derivative of the root קטל ("to kill") is used, and in Amos 5:25 the targumist interprets sacrifices

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also Zechariah 12:8.

<sup>2</sup>So in Joel 1:13; 2:17; Amos 9:1; Zechariah 9:15; 14:20; Malachi 1:7,10; and 2:13.

<sup>3</sup>So in Hosea 8:11 (twice); 10:1,2,8; 12:12(11); Amos 2:8; and 3:14 (twice).

<sup>4</sup>Sacrificing to God in Jonah 2:10(9).



to mean קורשין הניכס ("hallowed victims"). The most interesting change occurs in Hosea 4:19 where the Targum explains that Israel will be ashamed because of her idolatrous altars (אנורא) instead of because of her sacrifices.

In connection with the acts of worship one more passage needs to be noted. In Malachi 1:12 the statement in the Targum concerning the polluting of the table of the Lord is softened perhaps by the translation, פחורא דיהוה בסיר ("... the table of Yahweh is a shameful thing, and shameful are the gifts from it.").

### 3. THE USE OF כהן ("PRIEST")

With three exceptions in the Targum of the Twelve the word כהן ("priest") is translated literally. In Hosea 4:4 the idea of striving with the priests is softened to the teachers (מלפיהון) and in Amos 7:10 רבא ("great") translates כהן when it refers to Amaziah, the priest of Bethel.

According to Churgin the idolatrous priest is translated פלחא<sup>1</sup>, but in the Targum of the Twelve this word does not occur as the translation of כהן. In Zephaniah 1:4 כומריוהון designates the idolatrous priests.

### 4. THE USE OF במה ("HIGH PLACE")

The targumist does not follow a consistent policy of translating במה ("high place"). In Hosea 10:8 the Targum

<sup>1</sup>Churgin, op. cit., p. 115.

renders the high places of Aven as the high places (במה) of Bethel. This same word also occurs in Amos 7:9, but in Amos 4:13 רשעי occurs. In Micah 1:3 and Habakkuk 3:19 חוקפי translates במה, and in Micah 1:5 ומהי במות יהודה ("And what is the high place of the house of Judah?") is softened to איכא חסו דבית יהודה ("where have those of house of Judah sinned?").

#### 5. THE TRANSLATION OF תרפים ("TERAPHIM")

The word תרפים ("teraphim") occurs only twice in the Twelve. In Zechariah 10:2 it is rendered as פלחי צילמיה ("worshippers of images") and in Hosea 3:4 as וסחרי ("and oracles").

#### 6. THE TRANSLATION OF אפוד ("EPHOD")

This word (אפוד) occurs only in Hosea 3:4 where it is rendered literally.

#### 7. THE TRANSLATION OF משפט ("JUDGMENT")

In the Twelve משפט ("judgement") usually is translated by a corresponding Aramaic word גינא. In Hosea 5:1 the idea of judgment pertaining to Israel is rendered as למדע רחלחי ("to know My Fear") and in Micah 7:9 the command to execute judgment, as ויחפרע עולבני ("and avenges my wrong doing").

#### 8. THE TRANSLATION OF חק ("STATUTE")

The targumist clearly distinguishes between profane or idolatrous statutes and the holy statutes of God. The latter

word (pn), as in Amos 2:4; Zechariah 1:6; Malachi 3:7; and 4:6(3:22), consistently is translated as קים ("covenant"). On the other hand, pn when it refers to the profane or idolatrous statutes, as in Zephaniah 2:2, consistently is rendered in the Targum as נזירא<sup>1</sup>.

## 2. THE TRANSLATION OF נביא ("PROPHET")

The targumist reserves נביא ("prophet"), the Aramaic equivalent, to translate נביא ("prophet") whenever it applies to the true messenger of God<sup>2</sup> as, for example, in Hosea 6:5; Micah 3:11<sup>3</sup>; etc. Whenever the term נביא suggests professional prophetism (or that they emit a false message), the term סדר ("scribe") occurs, as in Zechariah 7:3. In Micah 3:5<sup>4</sup>, 6; Zechariah 13:2, 4, for example, the context suggests that נביא refers to the prophet of another deity. In these passages the targumist renders נביא literally but adds נ שקרא ("false")<sup>5</sup>.

## 10. THE HOUSE (בית) OF GOD

With six exceptions (Haggai 1:8; 2:3, 7, 9; Zechariah

---

<sup>1</sup>So Churgin, *op. cit.*, pp. 117f.

<sup>2</sup>Following Churgin's (*loc. cit.*) statements in this paragraph.

<sup>3</sup>Here סדר ("scribe") or the addition of שקרא ("false") might have been anticipated.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Churgin, *op. cit.*, p. 118, who incorrectly reads Micah 2:5.

<sup>5</sup>So also Hosea 4:5.

4:9; and 14:21) the targumist always adds **מִקְדָּשׁ** ("sanctuary") to distinguish the house of the true God from those of idols or the usual profane homes and palaces. This addition occurs in twenty-three passages, e.g., Hosea 8:1. This tendency to distinguish between the holy and the profane house may be seen also in the statements which the targumist adds to the Hebrew text and in the statements which include the phrase, "the house of the sanctuary", as in Hosea 9:11; 12:1; Joel 2:14; Zephaniah 3:7; and Zechariah 8:3, as well as in the interesting translations of Amos 6:9 and Zechariah 10:10.

#### 11. THE INCREASED IMPORTANCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OR SYNAGOGUE

Even more so, the importance of the concept of the Assembly or Synagogue of Israel is seen in the addition of **בְּנֵי־עֵמֶת** ("assembly, synagogue") in Hosea 2:4(2), 7(5), 15(13); 3:3; 4:5; Amos 5:2, 12, 15; 8:13; 9:6; Micah 2:9; 4:8, 10, 13; 7:11; Zephaniah 3:14; Haggai 2:14; Zechariah 2:11, 14; and 9:9.

## APPENDIX V

### THE INTERMEDIARY DEVICES OF THE TARGUM

Most of these devices<sup>1</sup> have been discussed earlier and have been treated particularly in Chapter IX. The agency of the Spirit of God was discussed in Chapter VI, pages 203-206. Here two more intermediary devices or agencies are considered: (1) the Law (Torah), and (2) the Messiah (including the development of Messianic beliefs).

#### 1. THE INCREASED IMPORTANCES OF THE TORAH (LAW)

In the Book of the Twelve the targumist refers to the Law (Torah) of God in at least thirty-six passages where the Masoretic Text makes no such references.

He considers that the children of Israel cease to be God's people whenever they fail to follow God's Law (Hosea 1:9 and 2:1). Therefore, failure to obey the Law (Torah) resulted in disasters for Israel (Hosea 2:5(3); 10:1; 13:14; Amos 4:12<sup>2</sup>; 9:1; cf. also Hosea 4:14; 5:4<sup>3</sup>; 7:16; 10:2; Amos 3:10; 5:10; Zephaniah 2:1). Similarly, other peoples also suffer for failure to accept and to follow the Torah (Micah

---

<sup>1</sup>One interesting change occurs in the Targum of Amos 6:10. The Targum translates ה כִּי לֹא לְקוֹצִיר בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֲרֵי כֹר ("We must not mention the name of the Lord.") as ה הוּוּ קִיִּימִין לֹא הוּוּ מַצֵּלִין בְּשֵׁם דִּיהוָה ("Because as long as they were established they were not praying in the name of Yahweh").

<sup>2</sup>See pages 285f.

<sup>3</sup>See page 274.



5:14). On the other hand returning to God and repenting means the return to the Torah, i.e., to its observance, (Hosea 2:3(1); 10:12; 11:7; 13:9<sup>1</sup>; Micah 1:12; 4:2; Nahum 1:3; Habakkuk 3:1,2,7; cf. Hosea 6:6). In fact, whenever Israel turned to God, His Memra assisted them (Hosea 13:9<sup>1</sup>). God also prefers people to follow (serve) the Torah rather than to make sacrifices (Hosea 6:6<sup>2</sup>).

The targumist also emphasizes that God has revealed the Law to Israel (Hosea 2:16; 5:9; Nahum 1:6; Habakkuk 3:3; Zechariah 13:1; Malachi 2:5) and that Israel was prosperous when she followed the Torah (Hosea 9:13). The teaching of the Torah is considered to be beautiful (Zechariah 9:17), and the targumist identifies knowledge with the Torah (Hosea 6:6<sup>3</sup>; cf. Hosea 5:4; Amos 3:10<sup>4</sup>).

## 2. THE CONCEPT OF THE MESSIAH AND THE MESSIANIC AGE

As Churgin<sup>5</sup> notes, the targumist followed many of the Messianic ideas which were current in his days, e.g., the exile would be ended and Judah and Israel would be reunited (Hosea 2:2(1:11); 11:10,11; 14:8; Amos 9:11; Micah 5:2,3; 7:12), with a descendent of the house of David as their king

---

<sup>1</sup>See pages 291f.

<sup>2</sup>See page 273.

<sup>3</sup>Churgin, op. cit., p. 122.

<sup>4</sup>Loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 124f.



(Hosea 2:2(1:11); 3:5; Amos 9:11; cf. Zechariah 3:8; 10:4). This leader was to be their king and Messiah (Hosea 3:5) who existed from the beginning and had been hidden because of Israel's sins (Micah 4:8; 5:1; Habakkuk 3:18; cf. Zechariah 4:7; 6:12). The kingdom was to be God's (Obadiah 21), and at that time the united Israel would be the chief nation and highly exalted (Amos 9:11f; cf. Zephaniah 2:3). The temple would then be rebuilt by the Messiah (Zechariah 6:12).

For the heathen, the prospects were not so bright. God would take vengeance on all those heathen who had hated Israel (Nahum 1:2,3; Joel 4[3]:21; cf. Malachi 3:19[4:1]). Likewise, not all Israelites would prosper. The righteous would be resurrected and would live eternally (Hosea 6:2; 14:8,10;), but the wicked would be thrown into Gehenna (Hosea 14:10). In connection with this judgment two other facts should be noted: (1) that the wicked had been given an extra long time in this world in order to repent and to return to the Torah (Habakkuk 3:1,2; cf. Zephaniah 2:1,2) -- in fact, the Torah then would be revealed (Zechariah 13:1) -- and (2) the world then would be renewed (Habakkuk 3:2). Wonders and miracles will accompany the advent of the Messianic Age even as they did the Exodus from Egypt (Zechariah 10:11).

## APPENDIX VI

### THE ATTITUDE OF THE TARGUMIST TOWARDS THE HEATHEN AND THE KINGDOMS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH

The targumist, like the Greek translator, made certain changes in his translation which may reflect a bias towards the heathen and the earlier kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

#### 1. THE TARGUMIST'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS ISRAEL AND JUDAH<sup>1</sup>

The targumist, in his treatment of the Book of the Twelve, exhibits no hatred toward the northern Israelites -- for example, he exhibits partiality toward both Ephraim and Judah.

#### HOSEA 4:17

חבור עצבים אפרים הנה-לו	Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone.
1 אית חבורו לסעוהא ביה ישראל שבקו להון יה פולחני	The men of the house of Israel have been joined to idols; they have left My worship.

This translation softens the idea that Israel is left alone -- presumably by God; it places the blame for the separation more clearly upon Israel's shoulders.

In Hosea 2:17(15); Joel 2:21; Zechariah 9:8; and 12:4 the pro-Israel and pro-Judah bias of the Targum is more self-evident. In these passages additions have been made which

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; Appendix III.

state that God will do good unto Israel. Moreover, in Amos 9:7, the targumist changes the comparison of Israel to Ethiopians before God, to likening Israel to beloved children before God. In the Targum of Micah 5:9(8)-14(13) the translator softens the statements that God will remove Israel's horses, chariots, cities, images, statutes, etc., from her<sup>1</sup>. Instead God is promising to remove the horses, idols, etc., of the heathen from the midst of Israel.

The targumist also may exhibit a pro-Israel bias in the extension of the kingdom of Israel to include Damascus (Zechariah 9:1), Hamath<sup>2</sup> (Zechariah 9:2), etc. Moreover, Israel also will conquer the Chaldeans (Habakkuk 2:8) and will rule over the heathen (Amos 9:11f).

In the Targum, as in the Septuagint<sup>3</sup>, there are passages in which Israel is closely identified with God; e.g., in Nahum 1:11<sup>4</sup> the devising against God is changed to devising against the people of God (עַל עַמּוֹת דִּיהוָה<sup>5</sup>) and the substitution of "my people" for the pronominal suffix "My" in Zechariah 1:17 (cf. the addition of "my people" in Joel 1:7).

Another good example of this close identification of

---

<sup>1</sup>So Cohen (op. cit., pp. 177f), et al.

<sup>2</sup>See also Appendix II; cf. also Habakkuk 2:17.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Appendix III, pages 386f.

<sup>4</sup>See also Nahum 1:9; Hosea 7:15.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. also Habakkuk 3:12.

God with His people occurs in Nahum 1:2. Here the targumist alters the idea of God taking vengeance upon His adversaries, etc., ( נקם יהוה לצריו ונוטר הוא לאיביו ) by the addition of "His people." Thus the targumist translates: עמיו

יהוה לאיחרעא מסנאי עמיה וברנו חסין מבעלי דבבוהי ("Yahweh <sup>is about</sup> comes to take vengeance upon those hating His people and with vehement wrath against the ~~masters~~ [Baalam] of their [His] enemies").

The Targum also changes Micah 2:8:

ואחמול עמי לאויב	But yesterday my people
יקומם	rose <sup>1</sup> as an enemy;
מקביל חוב יהון עמי	Because of the sins of
לבעיל דבא מסירין	My people, they have been
	handed over to the enemy.

This translation avoids the suggestion that Israel was opposed to God. Similarly, the translation in Hosea 12:1 exalts the children of Israel by calling them "the Holy People" because they were steadfast.

In Hosea 2:9(7) the targumist also adds the statement, "from now on I [Israel] will not worship idols" ( מכען לא אפלה ). Similarly, Hosea 4:10 in the Targum is softened to "taking wives" ( יסבון נשין ) for "committing harlotry" ( חינו ). Another pro-Israel softening occurs in verse 6 of the same chapter. There the clause נדמו עמי מבלי הדעה ("My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge;") is

<sup>1</sup>Following Revised Standard Version, footnote e, page 966.

rendered in the Targum as אִימְשׁוּ עַם כְּבִילִי דַעְתָּא ("My people have become foolish because of lack of knowledge.").

The targumist also softens the idea that the Israelitish people would come in fear ( וּפְחָדוֹ ) to Yahweh in Hosea 3:5<sup>1</sup>. This clause he translates as וַיִּתְּנֶהוּ לְפִלְחָנָא דִּיהוָה ("and they shall follow eagerly the worship of Yahweh").

Certain actions of God (other than those already considered) were altered (or softened) by the targumist because of His pro-Israel bias. He softens the idea of God selling ( מָכַר )<sup>2</sup> a people into slavery by translating the idea as handing over or delivering ( מָסַר ) the people. Similarly, in Zechariah 9:13 the targumist avoids stating that God bends ( דִּרְכָּהִי ) Judah by the translation, אֲרִי אֲחֻקִּיפִיָּה קִדְמִי דְּבֵיתָא ("Because I have made the house of Judah strong before Me.").

This group of alterations also includes the following two passages:

(1) HOSEA 14:9(8)

וְאֶשׁוּרְנוֹ	And [I] look on him <sup>3</sup> ;
וְאִירְחִים עֲלוֹהֵי	And I will have compassion upon them.

<sup>1</sup>See page 298.

<sup>2</sup>Joel 4:3(8); see page 272.

<sup>3</sup>American Jewish Translation.



## (2) HOSEA 2:5(3)

מן-אפשיטנה ערמח

Lest I strip her naked

. . .

דילמא איסלק שכינה  
מינהLest I should remove My  
Shekinah from her . . .

## 2. THE ANTI-HEATHEN ATTITUDE OF THE TARGUMIST

A few passages in the Twelve suggest that the targumist may have hated all Gentiles. In Micah 7:11 the Targum states that the decrees of the heathen will be useless and, in verse 17, that the heathen will be broken in Yahweh's presence. Similarly, in Habakkuk 3:12,17; Nahum 1:9; Zephaniah 2:10; etc., destruction is promised by God upon those nations who have spoiled Israel<sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also Zechariah 8:2.



## APPENDIX VII

### ANTHROPOMORPHIC PASSAGES IN THE TARGUM

The Targum, unlike the Septuagint, has very few passages which are more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text. In Hosea 11:3 the Targum supports the Septuagint<sup>1</sup> against the Masoretic Text in suggesting that God carried Israel on His arms (shoulders). This fact suggests that they represent a Hebrew text more original than the Masoretic Text:

קחם על-זרועתיו	Taking them by their arms; <sup>2</sup>
וּנְסַלְחֵנוּן כִּיד עַל דְּרַעִין <sup>3</sup>	. . . and I carried them upon the arms;

The Targum of Hosea 11:2 also supports the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text:

קראו להם	The more they <sup>4</sup> called them
שְׁלַחִיה נְבִיִּי לְאַלְפָּא לְהוֹן	I sent My prophets to teach them. . .

This translation suggests that the targumist is attempting to avoid some anthropomorphism such as the Septuagint's καθως μετεκαλεσα αυτους<sup>5</sup> ("The more I called them,").

---

<sup>1</sup>See pages 216f.

<sup>2</sup>American Jewish Translation.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 158f.

<sup>4</sup>Following the Revised Standard Version, footnote y, p. 944.

<sup>5</sup>See pages 163f.

Another passage in which the Targum is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text is Zephaniah 3:17. Here God is said to be silent ( יִחְרִישׁ בְּאַהֲבָתוֹ ) in His love; the targumist renders it as: יִכְבוֹשׁ עַל חֻבֵּךְ בְּרַחֲמָתִיהָ ("He will tread upon [stamp out] your sins with [by] His love.").

In Nahum 2:14(13) and 3:5 the expression חֲנוּי אֵלַיךְ (הַאֲנִי) הֵא אֲנִי שְׁלַח ("behold I am against you,") is translated as חֲנוּי אֵלַיךְ ("Behold I am sending My anger against you. . ."). Perhaps this rendering safeguards the targumist's conception of Deity; but this passage, coupled with the translations of Nahum 1:4 נֹעַר בַּיָּם ("He rebukes the sea. . .") and of Malachi 3:11 וְנִעַרְתִּי לָכֶם בְּאֵכָל ("I will rebuke the devourer for you,"), respectively, as מִיֵּן בֵּימָה ("Who is angry at the sea. . .") and וְאֲנִי לִכְנוֹן בְּמַחֲבֵלָא ("And I will be angry for you with the destroyer,"), suggests that in these four passages the Targum is more anthropopathic than the Masoretic.

In connection with the instances in which the Targum is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text; it must be recalled that the Targum retains many anthropomorphisms. God is still said to fight<sup>1</sup> and to have an inheritance<sup>2</sup>. In the only passage in the Twelve where God is pictured as a Judge<sup>3</sup>,

<sup>1</sup>Zechariah 14:3.

<sup>2</sup>Joel 2:17; 4(3):2; Micah 7:14?, 18. The targumist softens the idea of God inheriting slightly in Zechariah 2:16 (12); cf. Zechariah 9:4.

<sup>3</sup>Micah 4:14(5:1).

the Targum has a plural for the singular of the Masoretic Text. This plural avoids the anthropomorphism, but perhaps the targumist had a plural in his text since, in the Targum of Joel 4(3);12<sup>1</sup> and of Micah 4:3, God is described as judging<sup>2</sup>.



---

<sup>1</sup>In Joel 4(3):2 God is described as taking vengeance (Ith. of מִרְעָה) instead of judging.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. also Micah 4:3; Habakkuk 1:12.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. COMMENTARIES

- Andre, Tony, Le Prophète Aggée. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1895. 367 pp.
- Bassett, F. Tilney, The Book of the Prophet Hosea. London: W. MacIntosh, 1869. XVI, 91 pp.
- Baur, Gus, Der Prophet Amos. Giesen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1847. X, 452 pp.
- Cripps, R.S., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary On The Book of Amos. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929. 18, 365 pp.
- Dahl, J.C.W., Amos. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck-Ruprecht, 1795. XII, 266 pp.
- Drake, William, Notes Critical and Explanatory on the Prophecies of Jonah and Hosea. Cambridge: MacMillan and Co., 1853. VII, 180 pp.
- Drake, William, Notes on the Prophecies of Amos. London: Williams and Norgate, 1869. VII, 72 pp.
- Eakin, Thomas, The Text of Habakkuk Chapter I, 1 - II, 4. Toronto: An Accepted Disertation submitted to the University for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Printed by E. D. Apted, June 1905. 26 pp.
- Edghill, E. A., The Book of Amos. Westminster Commentaries. London: Methuen and Co., 1926. XVI, 119 pp.
- Ewald, G. H. A. von, Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament. London: Williams and Norgate, 1875. Tr. by J. F. Smith. 5 Vol.
- Gerleman, Gillis, Zephania. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1942. XII, 135 pp.
- Halder, Alfred, Studies in the Book of Nahum. Uppsala Universitets Arsskrift 1946:7. Uppsala: A.B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1947. VIII, 173 pp.
- Harper, W.R., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1905. CLXXXV, 424 pp.
- Henderson, E., The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1845. X, 463 pp.

- Holzhausen, F. A., Die Weissagung Des Propheten Joel.  
Gottingen: Bandenhoeck Ruprecht, 1829. VI, 181 pp.
- Hughes, J., The Prophecy of Joel. London: Samuel Bagster  
and Sons, 1869 (?). 20, 17 pp.
- Humbert, Paul, Problèmes Du Livre D'Habacuc. Neuchatel:  
Secretariat De L'universite, 1944. 303 pp.
- Kalisch, M.M., Bible Studies, Part II, The Book of Jonah.  
London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1878. XIV, 334, 6 pp.
- Kapelrud, Arvid S., Joel Studies. Uppsala: A-B Lundequistska  
Bokhandeln, 1948. VI, 211 pp.
- Keil, C. F., and Delitzsch, F., Biblical Commentary on The  
Old Testament. Keil, C. F., The Twelve Minor Prophets.  
Tr. by Rev. James Martin. Edinburgh: T and T Clark,  
1868. 2 Vol.
- King, E.G., The Yalkut on Zechariah. Cambridge: Deighton,  
Bell and Co., 1882. VIII, 122 pp.
- Kuiper, A.K., Zacharia IX-XIV Eene Exegetisch-Critische  
Studie. Utrecht: Kemink und Zoon, 1894. XIII, 172 pp.
- Lattey, C., The Book of Malachy. London: Longmans, Green  
and Co., 1934. XXXIV, 21 pp.
- Lowe, W. H., The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah.  
London: MacMillan and Co., 1882, XX, 155 pp.
- M'Caul, A., Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary Upon The Prophecies  
of Zechariah. London: James Duncan, 1837. XI, 188 pp.
- Marti, Karl, Das Dodekapropheton. Tübingen: J.C. Mohr (P.  
Siebeck), 1904. XVI, 492 pp.
- Merk, A., Die Prophetie des Joel. Halle: Verlag der  
Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1879. VIII, 458 pp.
- Mitchell, Alex., The Book of Jonah. London: Samuel Bagster  
and Sons, 1873. 89 pp.
- Mitchell, H.G., Smith, J.M.P., Bewer, J.A., A Critical and  
Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and  
Jonah. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912. XXVI, 362, 88,  
65 pp.
- Nyberg, H.S., Studien zum Hoseabuche. Uppsala: A-B  
Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1935. VII, 144 pp.
- Orelli, C. von, The Twelve Minor Prophets. Tr. by J. S.  
Banks. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1893. VII, 405 pp.



- Procksch, O., Jesaia I Kommentar zum alten Testament.  
Ernst Sellin, general editor. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche  
Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1930. Band IX,  
1st half. XI, 476 pp.
- Randolph, Andrew, Analytical Notes on Obadiah and Habakkuk.  
London: Rivingtons, 1878. VII, 60 pp.
- Reinke, Laur, Der Prophet Habakkuk. Brixen: Al. Weger's  
Buchhandlung, 1870. VIII, 172 pp.
- Reinke, Laur, Der Prophet Micha. Giessen: Emil Roth, 1874.  
226 pp.
- Reinke, Laur, Der Prophet Zephania. Münster: Wilhelm Niemann,  
1868. VIII, 144 pp.
- Reinke, Laur, Zur Kritik der älteren Versionen des Propheten  
Nahum. Münster: Wilhelm Niemann, 1867. X, 70 pp.
- Rignell, L. G., Die Nachtgesichte Des Sacharja. Lund:  
Gleerups, 1950. 268 pp.
- Robinson, T.H. and Horst, F., Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten.  
Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1938. VI, 267 pp.
- Rothstein, J.W., Die Nachtgesichte Des Sacharja. Kittel,  
R., editor, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament, W  
Heft 8. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910.  
218 pp.
- Rowley, A.C., Joel. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co., 1867.  
VIII, 34 pp.
- Rubinkam, Nathaniel, I., The Second Part of the Book of  
Zechariah. Basel: R. Reich, 1892. 84 pp.
- Ryssell, Victor, Die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches  
Micha. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1887. VI, 284 pp.
- Scholz, A., Commentar zum Buche des Propheten Hoseas.  
Würzburg: Leo Woerl, 1882. XXXIX, 204 pp.
- Scott, Melville, The Message of Hosea. London: Society for  
Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921. VIII, 151 pp.
- Sellin, Ernst, Das Zwölfprophetenbuch, Zweite Hälfte Nahum -  
Maleachi. Ernst Sellin, Editor, Kommentar zum Alten  
Testament. Leipzig: D. Werner Scholl, 1930. 2nd and  
3rd edition. pp. 353-619. Band XII.
- Seydel, W., Vaticinium Obadjae. Lipsiae: Henricum Matthesium,  
1869. 64 pp.



- Sharpe, John, Notes and Dissertations Upon the Prophecy of Hosea. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1884. 249 pp.
- Simpson, A., Der Prophet Hosea. Hamburg: Verlage von Friedrich und Andreas Perthes, 1851. VIII, 352 pp.
- Sinker, Robert, The Psalm of Habakkuk. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1890. 65 pp.
- Snaith, N.H., Notes on the Hebrew Text of Jonah. London: The Ephworth Press, 1945. 40 pp.
- Snaith, N.H., The Book of Amos. Part II. London: The Ephworth Press, 1946. 147 pp.
- Stephani, Roberti, Hoseas. Goettingae: Sumptibus Viduae A B R. Vaudenhoeck, 1775. Unnumbered pp.
- Smith, J.M.P., Ward, W.H., Bewer, J.A., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1912. XIX, 363 pp.
- Stonehouse, George G. V., The Book of Habakkuk. Rivingtons: London, 1911. VIII, 264 pp.
- Stonehouse, George G. V. and Wade, G. W., The Books of the Prophets Zephaniah and Nahum and The Book of the Prophet Habakkuk. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1929. IX, 219 pp.
- Strauss, F.A., Vaticina Zephaniae. Berlin: Sumtus Fecit Jones, 1843. XXXIV, 133 pp.
- Strauss, O., Nahum De Nino Vaticinium. Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz, 1853. LXXX, 136 pp.
- Wade, G.W., The Books of the Prophets Micah, Obadiah, Joel and Jonah. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1925. CXLIII, 156 pp.
- Wolff, A.A., Der Prophet Habakuk. Darmstadt: Carl Stanl, 1882. XXVIII, 326 pp.
- Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His Prophecies. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1879. 2nd edition. XLVIII, 614 pp.
- Wright, W., The Book of Jonah. London: Williams and Norgate, 1862. VII, 148 pp.
- Wunsche, A., Der Prophet Hosea. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1868. XLII, 607 pp.
- Wunsche, A., Die Weissagungen Des Propheten Joel. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1872. VII, 320 pp.

## B. GRAMMARS, LEXICONS, AND CONCORDANCES

- Bauer, Hans and Leander, Pontus, Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des alten Testamentes. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1922. XVI, 707, XII, VI, VI pp.
- Brown, Francis, Driver, S.R., and Briggs, C.A., A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. XIX, 1126 pp.
- Cowley, A.E., ed. and Tr., Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar as edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952. 2nd English edition. XVI, 598 pp.
- Davidson, A.B., Outlines of Hebrew Accentuation, Prose and Poetical. London: Williams and Norgate, 1831. XXIV, 118 pp.
- Driver, G. R., Problems of the Hebrew Verbal System. Old Testament Studies, No. 2. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1936. XII, 165 pp.
- Driver, S.R., A Treatise on The Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. Clarendon Press Series. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892. 3rd edition, revised and improved. XVI, 306 pp.
- Ewald, Heinrich, Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes. Siebente Ausgabe. Göttingen: Verlag der Dieterichschen Buchhandlung, 1863. VIII, 944 pp.
- Ewald, Heinrich, Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament. Translated from 8th German edition by James Kennedy. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1891. VIII, 323 pp.
- Green, William Henry, A Grammar of the Hebrew Language. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1898. New edition. VIII, 418, 23 pp.
- Hatch, Edwin and Redpath, Henry A., A Concordance to the Septuagint. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892. 3 Vol.
- Jastrow, M., A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli And Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. London: Luzac and Co., 1903. 2 Vol.
- Kennett, R. H., A Short Account of the Hebrew Tenses. Cambridge: University Press, 1901. VIII, 104 pp.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1952. Part. XIII. 820 pp.

- Levy, Jacob, Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1876. Band 4. Bound in 2 Vol.
- Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R., A Greek-English Lexicon. Rev. and Aug. by Sir Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. 9th edition. 2 Vol.
- Mandelkern, Solomon, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae. Lipsiae: Veit et Comp., 1896. XIV, 1532 pp.
- Newman, Selig, An English and Hebrew Lexicon. London: B. Wertheim, 1834. X, 408 pp.
- Schleusner, J. F., Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus: sive, Lexicon in LXX. et Reliquos Interpretes Graecos. Glassgow: Andrew John M. Duncan, 1822. 3 Vol.
- Weir, Thomas H., A Short History of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. London: Williams and Norgate, 1899. XV, 149 pp.
- Wickes, William, A Treatise on the Accentuation of the Twenty-one So-called Prose Books of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887. XVI, 155 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee Concordance of the Old Testament. London: Walton and Maberly, 1860. 2nd edition, revised. 2 vol.

#### C. PERIODICAL ARTICLES

- Adler, Michael, "A Specimen of a Commentary and Collated Text of the Targum to the Prophets Nahum," The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. VII, No. 28 (July, 1895), Pp. 630-657.
- Albright, W.F., "The Names Shaddai and Abrah," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIV (1935), Pp. 173-204.
- Aptowitzer, V., "Rabbinische Parallelen und Aufschlüsse zu Septuaginta und Vulgata," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, (1909), Pp. 241-252. u/
- Arnold, Wm. R., "The Composition of Naham 1 - 2:3," Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, (1901), Pp. 225-265.
- Asada, Eiji, "The Hebrew Text of Zechariah 1-8, Compared with the Different Ancient Versions," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 12 (1895-1896), Pp. 173-196.



- Bacher, W., "Notes on the Critique of the Text of the Targum of the Prophets," The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. 11, No. 44 (July, 1899), Pp. 651-655.
- Barnes, W. Emery, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament (Tikkun Sopherim)," The Journal of Theological Studies, No. 1 (1900), Pp. 387-414.
- Barnes, W.E., "The Recovery of the 'Septuagint'," The Journal of Theological Studies, No. 36 (1935), Pp. 123-131.
- Barnes, W.E., "On Influence of Septuagint on the Peshitta," The Journal of Theological Studies, No. 2 (1901), Pp. 186-197.
- Barnes, W.E., "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 17 (1916), Pp. 152-156, 385-388.
- Baudissin, W.W.G., "'Gott schauen' in der Alttestamentlichen Religion," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, 18(1915), Pp. 173-239.
- Beecher, Willis J., "Torah: A Word-Study in the Old Testament," The Journal of Biblical Literature, XXIV (1905), Pp. 1-16.
- Bertram, Georg, "Der Sprachschatz der Septuaginta und des Hebräischen Alten Testaments," Zeitschrift für Die Alttest. Wissen., Heft 1/2 Band 16 NF (1939), Pp. 85-101.
- Bertram, Georg, "Zur Septuaginta-Forschung", Theologische Rundschau, Band 3 NF, Heft 5 (1931), Pp. 283-296. Band 5 NF, Heft 3 (1933), Pp. 173-186. Band 10 NF (1938), Heft 2, Pp. 69-80. Band 10 NF (1938), Heft 3, Pp. 133-159.
- Bewer, James A., "New Lexical and Critical Suggestions," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 18 (1901-1902), Pp. 120-122.
- Bewer, J., "The Hellenistic Mystery Religion and the Old Testament," The Journal of Biblical Literature, 45(1926), Pp. 1-13.
- Box, G. H., "The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology," The Jewish Quarterly Review, 33 (1932), Pp. 103-119.
- Büchler, Adolf, "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle," The Jewish Quarterly Review, Vol. 5, No. 19 (April 1893), Pp. 420-468. Vol. 6, No. 21 (October 1893), Pp. 1-73.
- Budde, Karl, "Zu Text und Auslegung des Buches Hosea 4 Kap. 6, 7-7,2", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 53, No. II (1934), Pp. 118-133.

- Buhl, F., "Einige Textkritische Bemerkungen Zu Den Kleinen Propheten," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, (1885), Pp. 179-184.
- Carrier, A.S., "The Ἀπὸς Λεγόμενα of the Minor Prophets," Hebraica, V (1888-1889), Pp. 131-136, 207-214.
- Churgin, Pinkhos, "The Targum and the Septuagint," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 50 (1933-1934), Pp. 41-65.
- Cornill, D., "Das Targum zu den Propheten," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, (1887), Pp. 177-202.
- Cross, Frank M., "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," The Biblical Archaeologist, XVII (1954), Pp. 2-21.
- Dix, G. H., "The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits," The Journal of Theological Studies, 28 (1927), Pp. 233-250.
- Driver, G. R., "Linguistic and Textual Problems: Minor Prophets," The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 39 (1938), Pp. 154-166, 260-273, 393-405.
- Gaster, T. H., "Two Notes on Nahum," The Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 63, Part I (March, 1944), Pp. 51f. e/
- Gehman, Henry S., "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of I Samuel," Journal of the American Oriental Society, 70 (1950), Pp. 292-296.
- Gehman, Henry S., "The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek," Vetus Testamentum, Vol. I, No. 2 (April 1951), Pp. 81-90.
- Gehman, Henry S., "The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1-15," Journal of Biblical Literature, 68 (1949), Pp. 231-240.
- Gwynn, R.M., "Notes on the Authorship of Some Books of the Greek Old Testament," Hermantrena, 20 (1930), Pp. 52-61.
- Harper, William Rainey, "The Structure of Hosea 1:2-3:5," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 17 (1900-1901), Pp. 1-15.
- Harper, W.R., "The Structure of Hosea 4:1-7:7," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 20 (1903-1904), Pp. 85-95.
- Harper, W.R., "The Structure of Hosea 7:8-14:10," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 21 (1904-1905), Pp. 1-21.

- Haupt, Paul, "Critical Notes on Micah," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XXVI (1909-1910), Pp. 201-252.
- Haupt, Paul, "Notes on Micah," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 27 (1910-1911), Pp. 1-63.
- Humbert, Paul, "Essai d'analyse de Nahoum 1 - 2," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 44 (1926), Pp. 266-279.
- Kaminka, Armand, "Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der zwölf kleinen Prophetenbücher," Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, 72 (1928), Pp. 49-60, 242-273.
- Katz, Peter, "The Recovery of the Original Septuagint A Study in the History of Transmission and Textual Criticism," Les Grandes Entreprises Internationales, (unknown), Pp. 165-182.
- Katz, Peter, "Das Problem des Urtext<sup>23</sup> der Septuaginta," Theologische Zeitschrift, 5 Jahrgang Heft 1 J/F (1949), Pp. 1-24.
- Kelly, Fred T., "The Strophic Structure of Habakkuk," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 18 (1901-1902), Pp. 94-112.
- King, E.O., "The Influence of the Triennial Cycle on the Psalter," The Journal of Theological Studies, 5 (1904), Pp. 203-213.
- <sup>2</sup>  
Kunen, A., "Micah, I., 5.," Hebraica, II (1885-1886), Pp. 234-236.
- Manson, T.W., "Book Review of Fritsch, C.T. : The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943), pp. VI, 81, "The Journal of Theological Studies, 46 (1945), Pp. unknown.
- Margolis, Max L., "ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙΝ (including compounds and derivatives) and its Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in Old Testament Greek," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 22 (1905-1906), Pp. 110-119.
- Margolis, Max L., "ΚΑΙΕΙ (einschließlich der Komposita und Derivata) und seine hebräischaramäische Aquivalente im Gräzismus des A.T.," Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 26 (1906), Pp. 85-89.



- Margolis Max L., "Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament with its Semitic Equivalents: Its Necessity and the Means of Obtaining it," Journal of the American Oriental Society, 30 (1909-1910), Pp. 301-312.
- Montgomery, James A., "'The Place' as an Appellation of Deity," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXIV (1905), Pp. 17-26.
- Morgenstern, Julian, "Biblical Theophanies," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, XXVIII (1914), Pp. 15-60.
- Morgenstern, Julian, "Biblical Theophanies," Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, XXV (1911), Pp. 139-193.
- Mosapp, H., "Hos. 4:4," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, (1885), Pp. 184f.
- Nyberg, H.S., "Das Textkritische Problem des Alten Testaments am Hoseabuche demonstriert," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 52 (1934), Pp. 241-254.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., "Codex Taurinensis (Y). VI-IX," The Journal of Theological Studies, 8 (1907), Pp. 49-66, 233-239, 366-393, 515-524.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., "Codex Taurinensis (Y). VI-IX," The Journal of Theological Studies, 6 (1905), Pp. 372-380.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., "Codex Taurinensis (Y). VI-IX," The Journal of Theological Studies, 7 (1906), Pp. 51-74, 228-235, 373-392, 518-539.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., "Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets," The Journal of Theological Studies, 5 (1904), Pp. 76-88, 242-253, 378-386, 570-579.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., "Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets," The Journal of Theological Studies, 6 (1905), Pp. 67-70, 217-220.
- Orlinsky, Harry M., "On the Present State of Proto-Semitic Studies," Journal of the American Oriental Society, 61 (1941), Pp. 81-91.
- Orlinsky, Harry, "The Septuagint - its use in Textual Criticism," The Biblical Archaeologist, 9 (1946), Pp. 22-34.

- Orlinsky, Harry M., "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Job 14.12," The Jewish Quarterly Review, 28 (1937), Pp. 57-68.
- Patterson, Gayland H., "The Septuagint Text of Hosea Compared with the Massoretic Text," Hebraica, 7 (1890-1891), Pp. 190-221.
- Philebraens, \_\_\_\_\_, "On the Targumim, or Chaldee Paraphrases," The Christian Observer, I (February, 1802), Pp. 85-88.
- Praetorius, F., "Zum Texte des Amos," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 34 (1914), Pp. 42-44.
- Redpath, Henry A., "Mythological Terms in the LXX," The American Journal of Theology, 9 (1905), Pp. 34-45.
- Reider, Joseph, reviewer, "The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Psntateuch, by Charles T. Fritsch, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943, VII, 82 pp." Journal of Biblical Literature, 63 (1944), Pp. (unknown).
- Robertson, E., "Points of Interest in the Masoretic Text," The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 2 (1943), Pp. 35-39.
- Robinson, George Livingstone, "The Prophecies of Zechariah with Special Reference to the Origin and Date of Chapters 9-14," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 12 (1895-1896), Pp. 1-92.
- Robinson, T.H., "The Structure of the Book of Obadiah," The Journal of Theological Studies, 17 (1916), Pp. 402-408.
- Rudolf, W., "Obadja," Zeitschrift für die Alttest. Wissenschaft, Band 49, Heft 3/4 (1931), Pp. 232-231.
- Schwalley, Friedrich, "Das Buch Sse-fanjâ, eine historisch-Kritische Untersuchung," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 10 (1890), Pp. 165-240.
- Smith, Henry Preserved, "The Text of Micah," Hebraica, 4 (1887-1888), Pp. 75-81.
- Smith, John Merlin Powis, "A Note on Malachi 2:16a," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 28 (1911-1912), Pp. 204-206.
- Smith, John Merlin Powis, "The Strophic Structure of the Book of Micah," The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature, 24 (1907-1908), Pp. 187-208.
- Sperber, Alexander, "The Problems of the Septuagint Recensions," Journal of Biblical Literature, LIV (1935), Pp. 73-92.

- Sperber, Alexander, "Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 45 (1927), Pp. 267-288.
- Stade, Bernhard, "Deuterozacharja. Eine kritische Studie. 1. Theil," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, I (1881), Pp. 1-96.
- Taylor, John, "Hosea IV, 4," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1885, Pp. 300f.
- Thackery, H. St. J., "Primitive Lictionary Notes in the Psalm of Habakkuk," The Journal of Theological Studies, XII (1911), Pp. 191-213.
- Thackery, H. St. J., "The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books," The Journal of Theological Studies, 4 (1903), Pp. 578-585.
- Torrey, C.C., "On the Text of Amos v.26; vi.1,2; vii.2," Journal of Biblical Literature, 13 (1894), Pp. 61-63.
- Torrey, C.C., "The Prophecy of Malachi," The Journal of Biblical Literature, 17, Part I (1898), Pp. 1-15.
- Treitel, Leop., "Die Septuaginta zu Hosea," Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 41 (1897), Pp. 433-454.
- Vollers, K., "Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, I (1883), Pp. 219-272.
- Vollers, K., "Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, II (1884), Pp. 1-20.
- Waddell, W.G., "The Tetragrammaton in the LXX," The Journal of Theological Studies, 45 (1949), Pp. 158-161.
- Weiser, A., "Zu Amos 4:6-13," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 5 NF, Heft 1 (1928), Pp. 49-59.
- Wevers, John William, "A study in the Hebrew Variants in the Book of Kings," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 61 (1945-1948), Pp. 43-76.
- Wilson, R.D., "Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," The Princeton Theological Review, 27 (1929), Pp. 36-59.
- Wolfe, R.M., "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 12, Heft 2/3 (1953), Pp. 90-129.



Zimmerman, Frank, "The Perpetuation of Variants in the Masoretic Text," The Jewish Quarterly Review, 34 (1944), Pp. 459-474.

D. PUBLICATIONS OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, PARTS OF BOOKS, ETC.

Abrahams, Israel, "Rabbinic Aids to Exegesis," Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day, H.B. Swete, editor. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1909. Pp. 159-192.

Albright, W.F., "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, H. H. Rowley, editor. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1950. Pp. 1-18.

Allwohn, Adolf, "Die Ehe Des Propheten Hosea in Psychoanalytischer Beleuchtung," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 44 (1926). 76 pp.

Bacher, Wilhelm, "Aus dem Wörterbuche Tanchum Jeruschalmi's," Jahresbericht der Landes-Rabbinerschule in Budapest für das Schuljahr 1902-1903. Budapest: Adolf Alkalag und Sohn, Pressburg, 1903, 146, 38 pp.

Bachman, Johannes, "Zur Textkritik des Propheten Hosea," (ap.1-VII), Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen. Berlin: Verlag von S. Calvary und Co., 1894. Pp. 3-37.

Beer, Moses, "Anthropomorphism and Anthropopathism," The Jewish Encyclopedia. New York City: Funk and Wagnalls 1905-1906. Vol. I, pp. 621-625.

Bertram, G., "Der Begriff der Erziehung in der griechischen Bibel," Krüger, Gustav, Imago Dei. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1932. Pp. 33-51. b/

Bewer, J.A., "Critical Notes on Old Testament Passages," Harper, R.F., Brown, F., Moore, G.F., Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908. Vol. II, pp. 205-226.

Blank, Sheldon H., "The Septuagint Renderings of Old Testament Terms for Law," Hebrew Union College Annual. VII (1930). Pp. 259-283.

Blau, Ludwig, "Shekinah," The Jewish Encyclopedia. New York City: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1905-1906. Vol. II, pp. 258-260.

\_\_\_\_\_, Alttestamentliche Studien. Friedrich Nötscher Festschrift. H. Junker and J. Botterweck, editors. Bonner Biblische Beiträge. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1950. Vol. I, 292 pp.

- Büchler, A., Studies in Sin And Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century. Jews' College Publications, No. 11. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928. 461 pp.
- Budde, K., "Die Ueberschrift des Buches Amos und des Propheten Heimat," Semitic Studies. G.A. Kohut, editor. Berlin: S. Calvary and Co., 1897. Pp. 106-110.
- Daube, David, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," Hebrew Union College Annual. 22 (1949). Pp. 239-264.
- Debruner, Albert, "Zur Uebersetzungstechnik der Septuaginta. Der Gebräch des Artikels bei κύριος," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für d. Alttesta. Wissen. 41 (1925). Pp. 69-78. u/
- Deutsch, E., "On The Targums," Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch. London: John Murray, 1874. Pp. 319-403.
- Deutsch, E., "On Semitic Languages," Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch. London: John Murray, 1874. Pp. 293-318.
- Diringer, D., "Early Hebrew Script Versus Square Hebrew Script" Essays and Studies Presented to Stanley A. Cook. Cambridge Oriental Series II, D. Winton Thomas, editor. London: Oxford Taylor's Foreign Press, 1950. 123 pp.
- Driver, G.R., Semitic Writing. Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1944. London: Geoffrey Cumerlege, Oxford University Press, 1948. XXVI, 222, 57 pp.
- Eitan, I., "Biblical Studies," Hebrew Union College Annual. 14 (1939). Pp. 1-22.
- Fagani, Charles Prospero, "The Structure of the Book of Zephaniah," Harper, R.F., Brown, F., Moore, G.F., Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908. Vol. II, Pp. 259-276.
- Fairweather, W., "Development of Doctrine in the Apocryphal Period," Hastings, James, A Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1904. Extra Volume. Pp. 272-308.
- Frankel, Z., "Zudem Targum der Propheten," Jahresbericht Des jüdisch-Theologischen Seminar. Breslau: F. W, Jungfer's Buchdruckerei, 1872. Pp. 47, X.
- Gard, Donald H., The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job. J.B.L. Monograph Series, VIII. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952. VI, 107 pp.

- Gastor<sup>2</sup>, Theodor H., "Some Emendations in the Text of the Bible," Scheiber, Alex., Semitic Studies in Memory of Immanuel Löw. Budapest: Kertesz Jozsef Könyvnyomdaja, Karcag, 1947. Pp. 284-287. 2/
- Gerleman, Gillis, Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N.F. Åod. 1 Bel 44 Nr 5. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1948. 35 pp.
- Gerleman, Gillis, "The Septuagint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document," P.A.H. DeBoer, editor, Oudtestamentische Studiën. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950. Deel VII. Pp. 15-27. 4
- Ginsburger, M., "Die Anthropomorphisms in den Thargumim." D. Lipsius, D. Pfeleiderer, D. Schrader, editors, Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie. Braunschweig: C.A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1891. Vol. 17, pp. 262-280, 430-453. Sch/
- Greenup, A. W., "The Yalkut of R. Machir Bar Abba Mari on the Book of Jonah," London Theological Studies. London: University of London Press, 1911. Pp. 35-64.
- Grether, Oskar, Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 64. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1934. VIII, 280 pp.
- Herrmann, Johannes und Baumgärtel Friedrich, "Die Septuaginta zum zwölfprophetenbuch das Werk zweier Übersetzer," Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta. Kittel's, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament. 1923, Heft 5.
- Jansma, T., "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and Ancient Versions of Zechariah IX-XIV," Oudtestamentische Studiën. P.A.H. de Boer, editor. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950. Deel VII. Pp. 1-142.
- Johnson, Aubrey R., "Aspects of the Use of the Term ד'י in the Old Testament," Fück, J., editor, Festschrift Otto Eissfeldt. Halle an der Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1947. Pp. 155-159.
- Johnson, A.R., "Jonah II. 3-10: A Study in Cultic Phantasy," Rowley, H.H., editor, Studies in Old Testament Prophecy. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1950.



- Kadushin, Max, "Aspects of the Rabbinic Concept of Israel, A Study in the Mekilta," Hebrew Union College Annual 19 (1945-46). Pp. 57-96.
- Kahle, Paul E., The Cairo Geniza. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1941. London: Published for the British Academy, 1947. XII, 240 pp.
- Kaminka, A., "Septuaginta und Targum zu Proverbia," Hebrew Union College Annual, 8/9 (1931-32). Pp. 169-192.
- Kautzsch, E., "Religion of Israel". Hastings, J., editor, A Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1904. Extra Vol. Pp. 612-734.
- Kenyon, F.G., Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1932. London: Published for the British Academy, 1933. 119 pp.
- Kohler, Kaufmann, "Menra," The Jewish Encyclopedia. New York City: Funk and Wagnals Co., 1905-06. Vol. 8, Pp. 464f.
- Lieberman, Saul, "Corrections of the Soferim," Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950. Vol. XVIII, pp. 28-37.
- Löhr, Max, Untersuchungen zum Buch Amos. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, IV. Giesen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuch Handlung, 1901. 67 pp.
- Marcus, Ralph, "Jewish and Greek Elements in the Septuagint," Louis Ginsberg Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, English Section. New York: The American Academy for Jewish Research, 1945. pp. 227-245.
- Margolis, Max L., "Character of the Anonymous Greek Version of Habakkuk, Chapter 3," Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902. Vol. I, pp. 131-142.
- Merx, A., "Der Werth der Septuaginta für die Textkritik des alten Testaments," Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie, 9 Jahrgang (1883), pp. 65-77.
- Moore, G.F., "Notes on the Name, <sup>777</sup>," Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902. Vol. I, pp. 143-164.

Morgenstern, Julian, "Two Prophecies from 520-516 B.C.",  
Hebrew Union College Annual, 22 (1949), Pp. 365-431.

Naville, Edouard, The Text of the Old Testament. The Schweich Lectures, 1915. London: Published for the British Academy, 1916. VIII, 78 pp.

Neubauer, Ad., "The Introduction of Square Characters in Biblical MSS., and an Account of the Earliest MSS. of the Old Testament," Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891. Vol. III, Pp. 1-36. c/

Procksch, O., Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta: Die Propheten, Kittel, Rudolf, editor, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910. Vol. 7, 136 pp.

Robinson, H. Wheeler, The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Pp. 1-82.

Rust, E. C., Nature and Man in Biblical Thought. Lutterworth Library, Vol. 40. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953. X, 318 pp.

Sanday, W., "God (in NT)", Hasting, J., A Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1905, II, Pp. 205-215.

Schweizerische Theologische Umschau, Heft 3/4, 20. Jahrgang, Festschrift für Ludwig Köhler zu dessen 70. Geburtstag. Bern: Böhler und Co., 1950. 96 pp.

Seeligmann, I. L., The Septuagint Version of Isaiah A Discussion of its Problems. Leiden: E.G. Brill, 1948. X, 124 pp.

Silverstone, A.E., Aquila and Nihelos. Semitic Languages Series. <sup>On</sup> Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1931. XI, 172 pp.

Smith, H.P., "Theophorous Proper Names in the Old Testament," R.E. Harper, F. Brown, G.F. Moore, editors, Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902. Vol. I, pp. 35-64.

Sperber, A., "Problems of the Massora," Hebrew Union College Annual, 17 (1942-43), pp. 293-394.

Thackeray, Henry St. John, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship. The Schweich Lectures, 1920. London: Published for the British Academy by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1921. 143 pp.

- Torczyner, Harry; Harding, Lankester; Lewis, Alkin; Starkey, J.L., The Lachish Letters. The Wellcome Archaeological Research Expedition to the Near East Publications. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the Trustees to the late Sir Henry Wellcome, 1938. Vol. I, 223 pp.
- Treitel, L., Die Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Hosea. Karlsruhe, A. Bielefeld's Hof-Buch-Handlung (Liebermann and Co.), 1887. Heft I, 22 pp.
- Wevers, J.W., "Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of I Kings ii 12 - xxi 43," Oudtestamentische Studiën, Deel VIII. Uitgegeven Door P.A.H. DeBoer. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950. Pp. 300-322.
- Wutz, Franz, "Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus," (Kahle, Paul, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Vorleserischen Grammatik des Hebräischen, II), Kittel, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft von Alten Testament, N.F., Heft 9, 1933.
- Ziegler, Joseph, "Beiträge zum Griechischen Dodekapropheten," Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1943. Pp. 345-412.
- E. MISCELLANEOUS
- Abelson, J., The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1912. XI, 387 pp.
- Abrahams, I., The Glory of God. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1925. 88 pp.
- Baumgartner, W., et al., editor, Festschrift Alfred Bertholet zum 80 Geburtstag. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1950. 578 pp.
- Bertram, Georg., Der Anthropozentrische Charakter der Septuaginta-Üebersetzung. 8 Jahrgang, Forschungen und Fortschritte, Nr. 17, 10 Juni 1932. 219 pp.
- Boman, Thorlief, Das Hebräische Denken im Vergleich mit dem Griechischen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1952. 182 pp.
- Brierre-Narbonne, Jean-Joseph, Exégèse Targumique Des Prophéties Messianiques. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1936. 109 pp.



- Brierre-Narbonne, Jean-Joseph, Le Messie Souffrant dans la Litterature rabbinique. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1910. 180 pp.
- Buhl, Frants, Canon and Text of the Old Testament. John Macpherson, translator. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1892. VIII, 259 pp.
- Churgin, Pinkhos, Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. Yale Oriental Series - Researches XIV. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927. 152 pp.
- Dahne, August Ferdinand, <sup>n</sup>Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch - alexandrinischen Religions - Philosophie. <sup>n/</sup>Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1834. 2 Vol.
- Dalman, G., The Words of Jesus. Authorized English Version by D.M. Kay. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1902. XIV, 350 pp.
- Deissmann, G. Adolf, Bible Studies. Alex. Grieve, translator. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1901. XV, 384 pp.
- Deissmann, G. Adolf, The Philology of the Greek Bible. Lionel R.M. Strachan, translator. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908. X, 147 pp.
- Diringer, David, The Alphabet. London: Hutchinson's Scientific and Technical Publications, n.d. XII, 607 pp.
- Dodd, C.H., The Bible and The Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935. XV, 264 pp.
- Driver, S.R., An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. International Theological Library. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1913. 9th edition revised. XLI, XI, 577 pp.
- Eichrodt, Walther, Theologie des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1934. Band 1,2,3 in 2 Vols.
- Farrar, Frederic W., History of Interpretation. London: MacMillan and Co., 1886. LI, 553 pp.
- Frankel, Z., Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik. Leipzig: Verlag von Joh. Ambr. Barth, 1851. X, 354 pp.
- Frankel, Z., Vorstudien Zu Der Septuaginta. Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1841. XX, 275 pp.

- Fritsch, Charles T., The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943. VII, 81 pp.
- Giesebrecht, Friedrich, Die Alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens und ihre Religionsgeschichtliche Grundlage. Königsberg: Verlag von Thomas und Oppermann, 1901. VI, 144 pp.
- Ginsburg, Christian D., Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible. London: Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897. XII, 1028 pp.
- Gordis, Robert, The Biblical Text in the Making. Philadelphia: The Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1937. 219 pp.
- Gray, G. B., Studies in Hebrew Proper Names. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896. XIII, 338 pp.
- Grossoun, Willem, The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets. Monumenta Biblica et Ecclesiastica. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1938. XI, 126 pp.
- Hamp, Vinzenz, <sup>Begriff</sup>Der Begriff "Wort" in den Aramäischen Bibelübersetzungen. München: Filser-Verlag, 1938. 20, 217 pp.
- Hastings, James, A Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1904-06. 4 Vol. plus Extra Vol.
- Hatch, Edwin, Essays in Biblical Greek. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889. X, 293 pp.
- Humbert, Paul, Le Messie dans le Targum des Prophètes. Lausanne: Imprimeries Reunies, 1911. 71 pp.
- Jeffreys, Letitia D., Ancient Hebrew Names: Notes on Their Significance and Historic Value. London: James Nisbet and Co., Ltd., 1906. XIII, 186 pp.
- Johnson, Sherman Elbridge, The Septuagint Translators of Amos. Chicago: Private edition, distributed by The University of Chicago Libraries, 1938. 24 pp.
- Kadushin, Max, Organic Thinking. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1938. XVI, 367 pp.
- Kadushin, Max, The Rabbinic Mind. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1952. XVII, 394 pp.
- Keet, C.C., A Liturgical Study of the Psalter. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1928. 192 pp.



- Kenyon, F.G., The Text of the Greek Bible. London: Duckworth, 1949. 264 pp.
- Knight, George A.F., From Moses to Paul. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949. 194 pp.
- Kohler, K., Jewish Theology. New York: MacMillan Co., 1923. XIII, 505 pp.
- Lieberman, Saul, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950. XIV, 231 pp. *l/*
- Lightfoot, John, Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae. New edition by Robert Gandell. Oxford: University Press, 1859. 4 Vol.
- Marmorstein, A., Studies in Jewish Theology. J. Rabbinowitz and M.S. Lew, editors. London: Oxford University Press, 1950. XLVI, 229 pp.
- Marmorstein, A., The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God I. Names and Attributes of God. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1927. 216 pp.
- Marmorstein, A., The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God II. Essays in Anthropomorphism. Jews' College Publications No. 14. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1937. VIII, 163 pp. *m/*
- Maybaum, Siegmund, Die Anthropomorphien und Anthropopathien bei Onkelos und den Spätern Targumim. Breslau: F. W. Junfer's Buchdruckerei, 1870. 66 pp.
- Meecham, H.G., The Oldest Version of the Bible. London: Holborn Publishing House, 1932. XXVI, 371 pp.
- Montefiore, C.G., The Old Testament and After. London: MacMillan and Co., 1923. XI, 601 pp.
- Noth, Martin, Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. Stuttgart: unknown, 1928, XIX, 260 pp.
- Oesterley, W.O.E. and Box, G.H., The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1911. 2nd and revised edition. XVIII, 485 pp.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., and Box, G.H., A Short History of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920. XII, 334 pp.
- Östborn, Gunnar, Tōra in the Old Testament. Lund: Hakan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1945. XII, 212 pp.

- Ottley, Richard R., A Handbook to the Septuagint. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1920. XV, 296 pp.
- Prijs, Leo, Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948. XXV, 118 pp.
- Ramsey, A.M., The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1949. 160 pp.
- Reider, J., Prologomena to A Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila. Philadelphia: Printed at Oxford University Press, 1916. 160 pp.
- Ringgren, H., Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East. Uppsala (Sweden): Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1947. 234 pp.
- Rowley, H.H., editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951. XXXI, 405 pp.
- Silver, Abba Hillel, A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1927. XV, 268 pp.
- Smyth, J. P., The Old Documents and the New Bible. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd., 1890. XIV, 216 pp.
- Strack, H. L., Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1945. XVII, 372 pp.
- Streeter, B. H., The Four Gospels A Study of Origins. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1927. XVI, 624 pp.
- Swete, H.B., An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. XIII, 626 pp.
- Sturat, C.E., The Bible and The Versions of the Bible. (or The Vulgate Compared with the Original Scriptures). London: Wertheim and MacIntosh, 1856. 75 pp.
- Thackeray, H. St. John, Some Aspects of the Greek Old Testament. London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1927. 64 pp.
- Volz, P., Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr, 1903. XVI, 412 pp.
- Votaw, Clyde W., The Use of the Infinite in Biblical Greek. Ph.D. Chicago: Published by the author, 1936. 59 pp.
- Walton, F.E., Development of the Logos-doctrine in Greek and Hebrew Thought. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1911. 100 pp.

Young, Robert, Christology of the Targums. Edinburgh: Robert Young, n.d. V, 34, 34 pp.

# F. TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS, ETC.

Brooke, A.E., McLean, N., Thackeray, H. St. J., The Old Testament in Greek. Part I. I and II Samuel. London: Cambridge University Press, 1927. Vol. II, IX, 200 pp.

Cheyne, T. K., Critica Biblica. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1904. VI, 492 pp.

Cohen, A., editor, The Twelve Prophets. The Soncino Books of the Bible. Bournemouth, Hants.: The Soncino Press, 1948. VIII, 368 pp.

Davidson, S., The Hebrew Text. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, n.d. XVI, 221 pp.

De-Rossi, Johannis Bern, Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti. Parmae: Ex Regio Typographeo, 1784, Vol. I and III.

De-Rossi, Johannis Bern, Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti. Parmae: no publisher, 1793. Supplementa (Vol.).

Duhm, B., The Twelve Prophets. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912. VIII, 263 pp.

Field, Fridericus, Origenis Hexaplorum. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1875. 2 Vols.

Graetz, H., Emendationes in Plerosque Sacrae Scripturae Veteris Testamenti Libros. Breslau: S. Schottlaender, 1899. Part II. 33 pp.

Haupt, Paul, The Book of Nahum. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1907. 53 pp.

Kaerle, J., Lexicon Chrestomathiae Targumico-Chaldaicae. Viennae: Caes. Reg. Aulae et Imperrii Typographiae, 1852. VIII, 126, 172, X pp.

Kennedy, J., An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1928. IX, 255 pp.

Kennicott, Benjamin, editor, Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus. Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1780. Part II. 2 Vols.

Kittel, Rud., editor, Biblia Hebraica. Editio quinta typis editionis tertiae expressa. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1949. XL, 1434 pp.



- Lagarde, Paul de, Ammerkungen zur Griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1863. VIII, 96 pp.
- Lagarde, Paulus de, Prophetæ Chaldaice. Lipsig: B. G. Teubner, 1872. LI, 493 pp.
- Merx, A., Chrestomathia Targumica. Berlin: H. Reuther, 1888. XVI, 300 pp.
- Oesterley, W.O.E., Studies in the Greek and Latin Versions of the Book of Amos. Cambridge: University Press, 1902. VII, 112 pp.
- Oort, H., Textus Hebraici Emendationes. Lugdun, Batavia: E. J. Brill, 1900. IV, 150 pp.
- Pells, S. F., editor, The Old Covenant Commonly Called the Old Testament Translated from the Septuagint By Charles Thomson. London: Skeffington and Son, 1904. 2 Vols.
- Procksch, Otto, editor, Liber XII Prophetarum. 5th edition of Biblia Hebraica, Kittel R., editor. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1949. Pp. 895-976. c/
- Rahlf's, A., Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1949. Editio tertia. 2 Vols.
- Robinson, J. Armitage, editor. Text and Studies. Section 3. Cambridge: University Press, 1896. Vol. IV. VIII, 96 pp.
- Robinson, T. H., The Book of Amos. London: S.P.C.K., 1951. 61 pp.
- Rueben, Paul, Critical Remarks upon Some Passages of the Old Testament. London: Luzac and Co., 1896. 24 pp.
- Sanders, A.A., and Schmidt, C., The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis. New York: MacMillan Co., 1927. XIII, 436 pp.
- Sharpe, John, Micah, A New Translation. Cambridge: J. Hall And Son, 1876. XXXIII, 97.
- Stekhoven, J. K. Schuurmans, De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling van Het Dodeka-Propheton. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1887. VIII, 131 pp.
- Streane, A.W., The Double Text of Jeremiah. Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1896. VII, 379 pp.
- Swete, H.B., The Old Testament in Greek. 2nd edition. Cambridge: University Press, 1899. Vol. III, XX, 902 pp.

- Taylor, John, The Massoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Book of Micah. London: Williams and Norgate, 1890. XI, 195 pp.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: University Press, 1909. Vol. I, XX, 325 pp.
- The Holy Bible Revised Standard Version. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1952. VII, 997, 293 pp.
- The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament with an English Translation. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1879. VI, 1130, 4 pp.
- Vollers, K. A., Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner. Erste Hälfte. Berlin: Mayer und Mueller, 1880. 80 pp.
- Vollers, K., Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner. Inaugural Dissertations. Halle: No publisher listed, 1882. No record of pages.
- Wedell, A., De Emendationibus A Sopherim in Libris Sacris Veteris Testamenti Propositis. Vratislaviae: Henrici Lindneri, n.d. 37 pp.
- Winer, Georg Benedict, Chaldäische Lesebuch. Leipzig: C. H. F. Hartman, 1825. 78 pp.
- Workman, George Coulson, The Text of Jeremiah. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1889. XLIV, 398 pp.
- Zandstra, Sidney, The Witness of the Vulgate, Peshitta and Septuagint to the Text of Zephaniah. Ph.D. thesis at Columbia. New York: no publisher, 1909.
- Ziegler, Joseph, Duodecim Prophetarum. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1943. 339 pp.





# INDEX OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES

The references are to pages.

The passages in Chapters I to IX and the Appendices are included.

The small numerals (superscripts) indicate the number of times the passages are referred to on that page.

Genesis		17:1ff. . . . .	10
3:5 . . . . .	328	I Samuel	
6:2 . . . . .	328	4:22 . . . . .	142
14 . . . . .	328	15:29 . . . . .	207
32:30 . . . . .	10	20:25 . . . . .	165
33:10 . . . . .	328	II Samuel	
Exodus		7:7 . . . . .	44
20:4 . . . . .	2	I Kings	
24:16f. . . . .	9	2:12-21:43 . . . . .	382
33:20 . . . . .	3	11:34 . . . . .	152
Leviticus		II Kings	
9:23f. . . . .	9	2:24 . . . . .	10
Numbers		I Chronicles	
14:10 . . . . .	9	17:6 . . . . .	44
15:31 . . . . .	342	28:1 . . . . .	44
16:19 . . . . .	9	Job	
20:6 . . . . .	9	4:3 . . . . .	45
18 . . . . .	9	6:13 . . . . .	60
23:19 . . . . .	2	Proverbs	
25:25 . . . . .	44	3:15 . . . . .	152
Deuteronomy		19:16 . . . . .	104
4:15 . . . . .	3	20:21 . . . . .	139
5:5 . . . . .	342	25:10 . . . . .	60
21:14 . . . . .	90	Psalms	
22:13 . . . . .	90	33:6 . . . . .	342, 343
24:1ff. . . . .	90	105:19 . . . . .	342
Judges			
8:13 . . . . .	375		
9:20 . . . . .	10		
157 . . . . .	10		
13:18 . . . . .	10		

107:20 . . . . . 342  
119:11 . . . . . 342

## Isaiah

6:3 . . . . . 72  
10:5-15 . . . . . 23  
40:66 . . . . . 8  
40:2 . . . . . 23  
41:19 . . . . . 357  
49:22ff. . . . . 22  
60:5-16 . . . . . 22  
61:4 . . . . . 22  
    :5 . . . . . 22<sup>2</sup>  
    :6 . . . . . 22  
62:11f. . . . . 22

## Jeremiah

11:15 . . . . . 157

## Ezekiel

5:12 . . . . . 375  
16:42 . . . . . 375  
21:33-37 . . . . . 22  
24:13 . . . . . 375

## Hosea

1:1 . . . . . 17<sup>3</sup>, 18  
    :2 . . . . . 230, 287f., 331<sup>2</sup>  
    :4 . . . . . 47, 382  
    :5 . . . . . 24  
    :6 . . . . . 21, 151ff., 329<sup>2</sup>  
    :7 . . . . . 21, 24, 264, 265,  
        344, 346  
    :9 . . . . . 316, 344, 347, 348,  
        400  
    :14 . . . . . 47  
2:1(1:10) . . . . . 21, 27, 400  
    :2(1:11) . . . . . 21, 401, 402  
    :3(1) . . . . . 21, 401  
    :4(2) . . . . . 38<sup>2</sup>, 170ff., 179,  
        192f., 199, 200f., 331,  
        332<sup>2</sup>, 333, 344, 345,  
        399  
    :5(3) . . . . . 314, 331<sup>2</sup>, 399,  
        400, 407  
    :7(5) . . . . . 289, 399  
    :8(6) . . . . . 265, 266

:9(7) . . . . . 38, 201, 286, 297,  
        331<sup>3</sup>, 332, 333, 405  
:10(8) . . . . . 26, 393  
:11(9) . . . . . 320, 322, 344,  
        348  
:12(10) . . . . . 91, 148, 212,  
        217  
:15(13) . . . . . 47<sup>2</sup>, 303, 331<sup>2</sup>,  
        393, 399  
:16(14) . . . . . 21, 401  
:17(15) . . . . . 21, 27, 62, 344,  
        346, 390, 403  
:18(16) . . . . . 24, 38, 200, 201,  
        278, 328, 331, 332<sup>4</sup>,  
        393  
:19(17) . . . . . 21, 393  
:20(18) . . . . . 24  
:21(19) . . . . . 21, 39, 202  
:22(20) . . . . . 21, 39, 141,  
        202, 274  
:23(21) . . . . . 24, 62<sup>2</sup>, 231  
:24(22) . . . . . 24, 62  
:25(23) . . . . . 21, 194, 195<sup>2</sup>,  
        307, 339, 340  
3:1 . . . . . 21, 393<sup>2</sup>  
    :2 . . . . . 21, 264, 344, 346  
    :3 . . . . . 21, 201f., 289, 331,  
        399  
    :4 . . . . . 21, 358, 360<sup>2</sup>, 397<sup>2</sup>  
    :5 . . . . . 21, 144f., 283, 298<sup>2</sup>,  
        299, 331<sup>4</sup>, 332, 402<sup>2</sup>,  
        406  
4:1 . . . . . 20, 274, 334<sup>2</sup>  
    :2 . . . . . 216  
    :3 . . . . . 24  
    :4 . . . . . 396  
    :5 . . . . . 145f., 398, 399  
    :6 . . . . . 134, 135, 146, 273,  
        275<sup>2</sup>, 324<sup>2</sup>, 334, 382f.,  
        405f.  
    :7 . . . . . 7, 13  
    :9 . . . . . 20, 47<sup>2</sup>  
    :10 . . . . . 20, 289, 331<sup>2</sup>, 405  
    :11 . . . . . 26  
    :12 . . . . . 20, 26, 288, 331<sup>2</sup>,  
    :13 . . . . . 289, 357, 395  
    :14 . . . . . 26, 47<sup>2</sup>, 289, 395,  
        400  
    :15 . . . . . 20, 29, 30, 289,  
        383  
    :16 . . . . . 20, 21, 197, 198,  
        383  
    :17 . . . . . 26, 331<sup>2</sup>, 383f.,  
        403





:3 . .10, 68f., 77, 158f.  
     216f., 267, 270, 408  
 :4 . .39ff., 42f., 50<sup>2</sup>,  
     161f., 193f., 199,  
     269<sup>2</sup>, 344, 345  
 :5 . . . . . 20  
 :7 . . . 26, 28, 177, 401  
 :8 . . 21, 235, 250, 344,  
     345  
 :9 . . 21, 38, 193, 252,  
     309, 320, 339, 340,  
     344, 345, 348  
 :10 . .21, 74, 241f., 286,  
     331, 332, 344, 401  
 :11 . .21, 316f., 344, 347  
     348, 368, 401  
 12:1(11:12) . .19, 100, 287,  
     294, 297, 331, 386f.,  
     395<sup>2</sup>, 399, 405  
 :2(1) . . . 26, 198f., 374  
 :3(2) . . . . . 19, 47  
 :4(3) . . . 27, 149, 328<sup>2</sup>  
 :5(4) . . 27, 30<sup>2</sup>, 139, 328  
 :6(5) . . . . . 27  
 :7(6) . . . 21, 300, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :8(7) . . . . . 27  
 :9(8) . . . . . 27  
 :10(9) . . . . . 27, 362  
 :11(10) . . 27, 146, 230  
 :12(11) . . 20, 26, 395<sup>2</sup>  
 :13(12) . . . . . 27  
 :14(13) . . . . . 27, 322  
 :15(14) . . . . . 207  
 13:1 . . . . . 26, 393  
 :2 . . . . 26, 363f., 395  
 :3 . . . . . 70, 216  
 :4 . . . . 2, 27, 263, 273  
 :5 . . 27, 132f., 151, 236  
 :6 . . . . 27, 303, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :7 . . 58, 222f., 240, 344  
 :8 . . 67, 74, 227, 240<sup>2</sup>,  
     344  
 :9 . . 20, 101f., 291f.,  
     316, 344, 346, 347, 348  
     386, 401<sup>2</sup>  
 :10 . . . . . 27  
 :13 . . . . . 20, 334<sup>2</sup>  
 :14 . .21, 129<sup>2</sup>, 220, 229  
     296, 313, 326, 339,  
     344, 345, 400  
 :15 . . . . . 344, 374  
 14:1(13:16) . . 20, 290, 344,  
     346  
 :2(1) . . . . 21, 300, 334<sup>2</sup>

:3(2) . . . 21, 278, 299,  
     331<sup>2</sup>  
 :4(3) . . . . 21, 26, 393  
 :5(4) . .21, 267, 268, 385  
 :6(5) . . . . 21, 240, 344  
 :7(6) . . . . . 21  
 :8(7) . . . . 21, 401, 402  
 :9(8) . . 26, 58, 62, 223,  
     231, 241, 344, 346<sup>2</sup>,  
     406  
 :10(9) . . . . . 26, 402<sup>2</sup>

## Joel

1:7 . . . . . 260, 404  
 :8 . . . . . 394  
 :9 . . . . . 361  
 :13 . . . . . 361, 395  
 :15 . . . . . 24, 75f.  
 :20 . . . . . 166f.  
 2:1 . . . . . 24  
 :2 . . . . . 24  
 :10 . . . . . 24  
 :11 . . 24, 228, 229, 344,  
     345<sup>2</sup>, 371  
 :12 . . . . . 299, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :13 . .225, 248, 299, 331<sup>2</sup>  
     344, 347  
 :14 . . 249f., 319, 323,  
     361, 399  
 :17 . .264, 309, 344, 348,  
     395, 409  
 :18 . . . . . 245  
 :19 . . . . . 62, 232  
 :21 . . . . . 150, 403  
 :22 . . . . . 150  
 :23 . . . . 301<sup>2</sup>, 344, 346  
 :26 . . . . . 10  
 :27 . . . . . 308, 339  
 3:1(2:28) . . 24, 205, 368,  
     374  
 :2(2:29) . . . 24, 368, 374  
 :3(2:30) . . . . . 24  
 :4(2:31) . . . . . 24, 371  
 :5(2:32) . .10, 24, 65, 232  
     389f.  
 4(3):1 . . . . . 24, 320  
     :2 . . 17, 24, 93, 409,  
     410  
     :3 . . . . . 24  
     :4 . . 22, 182f., 186  
     :5 . . . . . 22  
     :6 . . . . . 22  
     :7 . . . . . 22

:8 . . . 22, 96, 229, 272,  
           344, 345, 406  
 :9 . . . . . 22  
 :10 . . . . . 22  
 :11 . . . 22, 115ff., 321f.  
 :12 . . . 17, 24, 311, 410  
 :13 . . . . . 22, 241  
 :14 . . . . . 24  
 :15 . . . . . 24  
 :16 . . . 24, 74, 110, 228,  
           344, 345  
 :17 . . . . . 24, 306<sup>2</sup>, 339  
 :18 . . . . . 24  
 :19 . . . . . 24  
 :20 . . . . . 26  
 :21 . . . 24, 26, 184f., 186,  
           306<sup>2</sup>, 339, 402

## Amos

1:1 . . . . . 17, 18  
 :2 . . . 26, 74, 228, 241,  
           317, 344, 345  
 :3 . . . . . 381  
 :5 . . . . . 27, 30f.  
 :6 . . . . . 22  
 :7 . . . . . 22  
 :8 . . . 22, 212, 337, 338  
 :9 . . . . . 22  
 :10 . . . . . 22  
 :11 . . . . . 22  
 :12 . . . . . 22  
 :13 . . . . . 381  
 2:4 . . . . . 398  
 :7 . . . . . 10, 16, 269  
 :8 . . . 269, 393, 395  
 :9 . . . . . 27  
 :10 . . . . . 27  
 :11 . . . . . 27  
 :12 . . . . . 27  
 :13 . . . . . 178f., 181  
 :14 . . . . . 24  
 :15 . . . . . 24  
 :16 . . . . . 24  
 3:1 . . . . . 27, 230<sup>2</sup>, 345  
 :2 . . . . . 47, 236  
 :7 . . . . . 27  
 :8 . . . . . 230  
 :10 . . . . . 400, 401  
 :13 . . . . . 20  
 :14 . . . . . 20, 47<sup>2</sup>, 395  
 :15 . . . . . 145  
 4:4 . . . . . 102  
 :5 . . . . . 373

:6 . . . . . 299, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :8 . . . . . 299, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :9 . . . . . 299, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :10 . . . 27, 148, 299, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :11 . . . 247, 299, 331<sup>2</sup>, 344  
 :12 . . . . . 24, 285f., 400  
 :13 . . . 25, 63, 72, 135,  
           225, 233, 238, 366,  
           374, 377, 397  
 5:2 . . . . . 399  
 :3 . . . . . 27  
 :4 . . . 20, 21, 282, 284,  
           334<sup>2</sup>  
 :5 . . . . . 20, 26  
 :6 . . . 20, 73, 241, 282,  
           284, 334<sup>2</sup>  
 :8 . . . . . 25, 65, 232  
 :10 . . . . . 345, 400  
 :11 . . . . . 197  
 :12 . . . . . 236, 269, 399  
 :13 . . . . . 24  
 :14 . . . 20, 315, 344, 347  
 :15 . . . . . 20, 390, 399  
 :17 . . . . . 27, 309, 318f.  
 :18 . . . . . 24<sup>2</sup>  
 :19 . . . . . 24  
 :20 . . . . . 24  
 :21 . . . . . 235, 246  
 :22 . . . 86<sup>2</sup>, 222, 256, 361  
 :23 . . . . . 238  
 :25 . . . . . 27, 361, 395f.  
 :26 . . . . . 394  
 6:1 . . . . . 27, 381f.  
 :2 . . . . . 27  
 :5 . . . . . 27  
 :6 . . . . . 27  
 :7 . . . . . 27  
 :8 . . . 37f., 203, 246<sup>2</sup>,  
           344, 346  
 :9 . . . . . 24, 399  
 :10 . . . . . 10<sup>2</sup>, 24, 400  
 :13 . . . . . 26  
 7:1 . . . . . 24, 95, 124  
 :2 . . . . . 24  
 :3 . . . . . 24, 249  
 :4 . . . 24, 65, 95, 124, 232  
 :5 . . . . . 24  
 :6 . . . . . 24, 249  
 :7 . . . 123f., 130, 213,  
           312  
 :8 . . . . . 318  
 :9 . . . . . 20, 320, 397  
 :10 . . . . . 17, 396  
 :11 . . . . . 27



7:12 . . . . . 17  
 :14 . . . . . 17  
 :16 . . . . . 345  
 :17 . . . . . 27  
 :18 . . . . . 27  
 8:1 . . . . . 124  
 :2 . . . . . 318  
 :3 . . . . . 10, 24, 160f.  
 :7 . . . . . 133, 134, 135, 324,  
 . . . . . 325  
 :8 . . . . . 24  
 :9 . . . . . 24, 321<sup>2</sup>  
 :10 . . . . . 24, 114, 115  
 :11 . . . . . 24, 277  
 :12 . . . . . 24  
 :13 . . . . . 24, 399  
 :14 . . . . . 24, 26, 394  
 9:1 . . . . . 24, 124, 279, 312,  
 . . . . . 337, 395, 400  
 :2 . . . . . 26, 213, 321<sup>2</sup>, 344,  
 . . . . . 346, 348  
 :3 . . . . . 26, 129<sup>3</sup>, 217f.,  
 . . . . . 296<sup>2</sup>, 313, 326, 344, 345  
 :4 . . . . . 27, 54, 217, 344,  
 . . . . . 345, 394  
 :5 . . . . . 24, 25, 216<sup>2</sup>  
 :6 . . . . . 25, 65, 125<sup>2</sup>, 232<sup>2</sup>,  
 . . . . . 308, 311, 337, 339, 352,  
 . . . . . 399  
 :7 . . . . . 24, 404  
 :8 . . . . . 21, 55, 218, 219  
 :9 . . . . . 21  
 :10 . . . . . 21  
 :11 . . . . . 24, 266, 401, 402<sup>2</sup>,  
 . . . . . 404  
 :12 . . . . . 24, 390, 402, 404  
 :13 . . . . . 24  
 :14 . . . . . 24, 197<sup>2</sup>, 320  
 :15 . . . . . 24, 196f., 197

## Obadiah

4 . . . . . 321, 344, 348  
 5 . . . . . 146  
 7 . . . . . 152  
 8 . . . . . 24  
 9 . . . . . 24  
 15 . . . . . 24  
 16 . . . . . 24  
 17 . . . . . 24  
 18 . . . . . 24, 229f., 344, 345  
 21 . . . . . 402

## Jonah

1:2 . . . . . 6<sup>2</sup>, 52, 137, 234  
 :3 . . . . . 6, 7, 52, 234  
 :4 . . . . . 69f., 72, 77, 215,  
 . . . . . 278  
 :5 . . . . . 393, 394  
 :6 . . . . . 130f., 136, 278<sup>3</sup>,  
 . . . . . 325<sup>2</sup>  
 :10 . . . . . 6, 7, 52, 234  
 :11 . . . . . 216  
 :13 . . . . . 216  
 :14 . . . . . 257, 278<sup>3</sup>  
 :16 . . . . . 395  
 2:3(2) . . . . . 26, 62<sup>2</sup>, 231, 238  
 :4(3) . . . . . 26  
 :5(4) . . . . . 26, 54, 217, 344,  
 . . . . . 345  
 :6(5) . . . . . 26  
 :7(6) . . . . . 26, 114f.  
 :8(7) . . . . . 26, 303, 310, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :9(8) . . . . . 26, 103  
 :10(9) . . . . . 26, 395  
 3:2 . . . . . 137  
 :5 . . . . . 301, 344, 346  
 :6 . . . . . 345  
 :7 . . . . . 198  
 :9 . . . . . 249, 252, 319, 323  
 :10 . . . . . 221, 248, 249<sup>2</sup>  
 4:2 . . . . . 235, 248, 249, 344,  
 . . . . . 347

## Micah

1:1 . . . . . 17<sup>2</sup>  
 :2 . . . . . 21, 46, 211, 310,  
 . . . . . 344, 345  
 :3 . . . . . 21, 72, 225, 310,  
 . . . . . 318<sup>2</sup>, 339, 397  
 :4 . . . . . 21  
 :5 . . . . . 26, 397  
 :6 . . . . . 26  
 :7 . . . . . 26  
 :8 . . . . . 84f., 90, 250f.  
 :12 . . . . . 401  
 2:1 . . . . . 167f.  
 :3 . . . . . 24, 237  
 :4 . . . . . 24  
 :5 . . . . . 24, 398  
 :7 . . . . . 136, 204<sup>2</sup>, 323, 344,  
 . . . . . 345, 346, 374, 375<sup>2</sup>  
 :8 . . . . . 294, 405  
 :9 . . . . . 142f., 376f., 399  
 :11 . . . . . 374  
 :12 . . . . . 21, 92, 93  
 :13 . . . . . 21, 127f., 316, 344,  
 . . . . . 348

3:4 . . . 5, 62, 128f., 129,  
130, 231, 234, 314,  
326, 339  
:5 . . . . . 398  
:6 . . . . . 398  
:7 . . . . . 62<sup>2</sup>, 206, 231  
:8 . . . . . 205f., 378  
:11 . . . 281, 309, 339, 340,  
344, 346, 398  
4:1 . . . . . 21  
:2 . . . 21, 94, 262, 270,  
311, 339, 340, 387,  
401  
:3 . . . . . 21, 410<sup>2</sup>  
:4 . . . 21, 226, 227, 229,  
344, 345  
:5 . . . . . 10, 27, 393  
:6 . . . . . 24  
:7 . . . . . 24, 210<sup>3</sup>  
:8 . . . . . 24, 399, 402  
:9 . . . . . 23  
:10 . . . . . 23, 168f., 399  
:11 . . . . . 23, 384  
:12 . . . . . 23, 93, 237<sup>2</sup>  
:13 . . . . . 23, 207, 399  
5:1(4:14) . . . 23, 43, 402,  
409  
:2(1) . . . . . 23, 27, 401  
:3(2) . . . . . 23, 401  
:4(3) . . . . . 23  
:5(4) . . . . . 23, 72  
:6(5) . . . . . 21, 72, 198  
:7(6) . . . . . 23  
:8(7) . . . . . 23, 91  
:9(8) . . . . . 24, 213, 404  
:10(9) . . . . . 24, 404  
:11(10) . . . . . 24, 404  
:12(11) . . . 26, 179f., 404  
:13(12) . . . 26, 360<sup>2</sup>, 404  
:14(13) . . . 23, 400f., 404  
6:1 . . . . . 277  
:3 . . . . . 27  
:4 . . . . . 27  
:5 . . . . . 27  
:6 . . . 26, 125<sup>2</sup>, 165, 285,  
311, 339, 340  
:7 . . . . . 26, 86  
:8 . . . . . 26, 286, 334<sup>2</sup>  
:9 . . . 10, 65, 228, 229,  
232  
:10 . . . . . 80, 83, 254  
:14 . . . . . 147  
:15 . . . . . 72  
:16 . . . . . 27

7:1 . . . . . 26  
:2 . . . . . 26  
:3 . . . . . 26, 180f.  
:4 . . . . . 26, 150  
:5 . . . . . 26  
:6 . . . . . 26  
:7 . . . 26, 150, 238, 263,  
280f.<sup>2</sup>, 344, 346  
:8 . . . . . 8, 26, 240  
:9 . . . . . 26, 253<sup>2</sup>, 397  
:10 . . . 26, 264, 309, 344,  
346  
:11 . . . . . 23, 399, 407  
:12 . . . . . 23, 401  
:13 . . . . . 26  
:14 . . . 26, 197<sup>2</sup>f., 198,  
260, 344, 349, 409  
:15 . . . . . 27, 95  
:16 . . . . . 26, 67  
:17 . . . 26, 144f., 297f.<sup>2</sup>,  
298, 407  
:18 . . . 26, 257, 318, 329,  
409  
:19 . . . 26, 85, 320, 344,  
348  
:20 . . . . . 26

## Nahum

1:2 . . . 26, 84, 90, 245,  
246, 252<sup>2</sup>, 261, 394,  
402, 405  
:3 . . . 26, 224<sup>2</sup>, 225, 235,  
401, 402  
:4 . . . . . 26, 409  
:5 . . . 6, 7, 26, 52, 234  
:6 . . . 26, 52, 81, 83, 252,  
255, 401  
:7 . . . 26, 108ff., 110,  
236, 281f., 344,  
346, 347  
:8 . . . . . 26  
:9 . . . 26, 185f., 295<sup>2</sup>,  
404, 407  
:10 . . . . . 26  
:11 . . . . . 295<sup>2</sup>, 404  
:12 . . . . . 21, 26  
:13 . . . . . 21  
:14 . . . . . 26, 196, 393  
2:1 . . . . . 21  
:3(2) . . . . . 21, 320  
:14(13) . . . . . 169f., 409  
3:5 . . . . . 95, 148, 409

## Habakkuk

1:2 . . . 26, 238, 239, 265  
 :3 . . . . . 26, 271  
 :4 . . . . . 26  
 :5 . . . . . 173ff., 379  
 :7 . . . . . 372, 379  
 :11 . . . . . 23, 26, 374, 393  
 :12 . . . . . 14, 23, 26, 74f.,  
 239, 344, 347, 410  
 :13 . . . . . 26, 67, 103, 217,  
 221f.<sup>3</sup>, 230f., 344,  
 345  
 :14 . . . . . 26  
 :16 . . . . . 395<sup>2</sup>  
 :17 . . . . . 23  
 2:1 . . . . . 230  
 :2 . . . . . 62, 231  
 :3 . . . . . 345  
 :4 . . . . . 26, 141f., 154<sup>2</sup>,  
 175f.  
 :5 . . . . . 26, 103  
 :6ff. . . . . 23  
 :8 . . . . . 404  
 :10 . . . . . 378  
 :13 . . . . . 26, 48, 211  
 :14 . . . . . 7, 26, 275, 334<sup>2</sup>  
 :16 . . . . . 214  
 :17 . . . . . 404  
 :18 . . . . . 26, 359f.  
 :19 . . . . . 26, 375  
 :20 . . . . . 6<sup>2</sup>, 26, 52, 234,  
 310f., 339, 340, 394  
 3:1 . . . . . 26, 401, 402  
 :2 . . . . . 26, 230, 252, 277,  
 325, 336, 337, 338,  
 344, 346, 401, 402<sup>2</sup>  
 :3 . . . . . 26, 311, 317, 337<sup>2</sup>,  
 339, 401  
 :4 . . . . . 26, 214, 313, 314,  
 337<sup>2</sup>, 339  
 :5 . . . . . 6, 7, 26, 52, 148,  
 224f., 234, 344, 345,  
 377  
 :6 . . . . . 26, 122f., 221, 291,  
 311, 337, 339, 344,  
 346, 378  
 :7 . . . . . 26, 401  
 :8 . . . . . 26, 251f., 252,  
 260f., 263, 315, 320,  
 337<sup>2</sup>, 338, 339, 351  
 :9 . . . . . 26, 91, 337, 338,  
 344, 350  
 :10 . . . . . 26, 108, 279, 337

:11 . . . . . 26, 259<sup>2</sup>, 337, 338,  
 344, 349  
 :12 . . . . . 26, 81, 82, 83,  
 119f., 255, 318, 404,  
 407  
 :13 . . . . . 26, 181, 263, 310,  
 344, 350, 366f.  
 :14 . . . . . 26, 215, 216  
 :15 . . . . . 26, 71, 226, 260,  
 337  
 :16 . . . . . 26  
 :17 . . . . . 26, 407  
 :18 . . . . . 26, 263, 280, 301<sup>2</sup>,  
 344, 346, 402  
 :19 . . . . . 26, 397

## Zephaniah

1:1 . . . . . 17<sup>3</sup>, 18<sup>2</sup>  
 :2 . . . . . 24, 145  
 :3 . . . . . 24, 26, 145<sup>2</sup>  
 :4 . . . . . 26, 212, 269<sup>2</sup>, 337,  
 338, 394, 396  
 :5 . . . . . 356  
 :6 . . . . . 166, 282, 284, 288,  
 331<sup>2</sup>, 334<sup>2</sup>  
 :7 . . . . . 6<sup>2</sup>, 24, 52, 234, 395  
 :8 . . . . . 24, 47<sup>2</sup>, 393, 395  
 :9 . . . . . 24, 47, 183f.  
 :10 . . . . . 24  
 :11 . . . . . 24, 146  
 :12 . . . . . 24, 47, 327  
 :13 . . . . . 197  
 :14 . . . . . 24  
 :15 . . . . . 24  
 :16 . . . . . 24  
 :17 . . . . . 169<sup>2</sup>  
 :18 . . . . . 24, 244<sup>2</sup>, 326f.  
 2:1 . . . . . 24, 400, 402  
 :2 . . . . . 24, 252, 398, 402  
 :3 . . . . . 24, 129<sup>2</sup>, 284, 296,  
 313, 326, 334<sup>2</sup>, 402  
 :4 . . . . . 22  
 :5 . . . . . 22, 345  
 :6 . . . . . 22  
 :7 . . . . . 22, 47, 320  
 :8 . . . . . 22, 238  
 :9 . . . . . 22  
 :10 . . . . . 380, 407  
 :11 . . . . . 24, 144<sup>2</sup>, 372, 394  
 :12 . . . . . 23  
 :13 . . . . . 23, 212, 269<sup>2</sup>, 337,  
 338  
 :14 . . . . . 23



:15 . . . . . 23  
 3:1 . . . . . 141, 385  
 :2 . . . . . 143, 229, 301,  
       331<sup>2</sup>, 344, 346  
 :4 . . . . . 16<sup>2</sup>  
 :5 . . . . . 26, 308, 327, 339  
 :7 . . . . . 47, 315, 339  
 :8 . . . . . 24, 81f., 83, 92,  
       154, 244<sup>2</sup>, 252, 255,  
       320, 344, 346  
 :9 . . . . . 10, 24, 299<sup>2</sup>  
 :10 . . . . . 24, 361  
 :11 . . . . . 24, 290, 320f.<sup>2</sup>,  
       344, 346  
 :12 . . . . . 10  
 :14 . . . . . 21, 344, 399  
 :15 . . . . . 21, 24, 57, 97,  
       222, 308, 320, 339,  
       384  
 :16 . . . . . 21, 24, 150, 162  
 :17 . . . . . 21, 66f., 231, 308,  
       339, 363, 409  
 :18 . . . . . 24, 362f.  
 :19 . . . . . 24  
 :20 . . . . . 24, 320

## Haggai

1:1 . . . . . 17  
 :3 . . . . . 345, 347  
 :8 . . . . . 86, 312f., 339, 398  
 :9 . . . . . 227f.  
 :11 . . . . . 64ff., 66, 148,  
       178, 232  
 :12 . . . . . 6<sup>2</sup>, 17, 52, 228,  
       234, 344, 345  
 :13 . . . . . 27, 315f., 344, 347  
 :14 . . . . . 17, 374  
 2:1 . . . . . 163  
 :2 . . . . . 17  
 :3 . . . . . 54, 398  
 :4 . . . . . 17, 316, 344, 347  
 :5 . . . . . 27, 150, 205f.,  
       345, 374  
 :7 . . . . . 7, 22, 169f., 337,  
       398  
 :8 . . . . . 22  
 :9 . . . . . 363<sup>2</sup>, 398  
 :14 . . . . . 6, 7, 37<sup>2</sup>, 52, 234,  
       399  
 :17 . . . . . 299, 331<sup>2</sup>  
 :21 . . . . . 170  
 :23 . . . . . 322

## Zechariah

1:1 . . . . . 17  
 :3 . . . . . 299, 320, 331<sup>2</sup>,  
       344, 348  
 :4 . . . . . 62, 276, 277<sup>3</sup>, 344,  
       346  
 :6 . . . . . 346, 375f., 398  
 :7 . . . . . 17  
 :12 . . . . . 79f., 83<sup>2</sup>, 90, 153,  
       253f.  
 :13 . . . . . 62, 232  
 :14 . . . . . 244f.  
 :15 . . . . . 22, 23  
 :16 . . . . . 85, 269, 320  
 :17 . . . . . 138, 250, 404  
 2:9(5) . . . . . 8<sup>2</sup>, 240, 308f.,  
       339, 344, 352  
 :10(6) . . . . . 93, 268, 269, 374  
 :11(7) . . . . . 399  
 :12(8) . . . . . 14f., 216  
 :13(9) . . . . . 22, 70, 212, 323,  
       337, 338  
 :14(10) . . . . . 306, 308, 317,  
       339, 399  
 :15(11) . . . . . 121f., 130, 306,  
       308, 339, 390f.  
 :16(12) . . . . . 409  
 :17(13) . . . . . 6<sup>2</sup>, 52, 125f.,  
       234, 309, 320,  
       322f., 326  
 3:2 . . . . . 313, 339  
 :7 . . . . . 262, 344, 349  
 :8 . . . . . 402  
 :9 . . . . . 120f., 168, 272  
 4:6 . . . . . 204<sup>3</sup>, 344, 345,  
       346, 374  
 :7 . . . . . 402  
 :9 . . . . . 398f.  
 :10 . . . . . 54, 55, 56f., 219  
 :14 . . . . . 207  
 5:9 . . . . . 374  
 6:1 . . . . . 22  
 :2 . . . . . 22  
 :3 . . . . . 22  
 :4 . . . . . 22  
 :5 . . . . . 22, 207, 374  
 :6 . . . . . 22  
 :7 . . . . . 22  
 :8 . . . . . 22, 204, 205, 374<sup>2</sup>,  
       375  
 :10 . . . . . 18<sup>2</sup>  
 :11 . . . . . 17

:12 . . . . . 402<sup>2</sup>  
 :14 . . . . . 18<sup>2</sup>  
 :15 . . . . . 228, 344, 345  
 7:1 . . . . . 17  
 :2 . . . . . 5<sup>2</sup>, 51, 53<sup>3</sup>, 234  
 :3 . . . . . 398  
 :7 . . . . . 65, 232<sup>2</sup>, 345  
 :8 . . . . . 17  
 :11 . . . . . 277<sup>2</sup>  
 :12 . . . . . 204<sup>2</sup>, 344, 346,  
                     374, 376  
 :13 . . . . . 65, 232, 238  
 :14 . . . . . 70, 215f.  
 8:2 . . . . . 245, 252, 407  
 :3 . . . . . 306, 308, 315,  
                     320, 339, 399  
 :6 . . . . . 54<sup>2</sup>, 218, 219,  
                     334, 335  
 :7 . . . . . 91, 263  
 :13 . . . . . 91, 150, 263  
 :14 . . . . . 248, 293, 344, 347  
 :15 . . . . . 150  
 :17 . . . . . 246  
 :21 . . . . . 5, 53, 164, 234,  
                     283  
 :22 . . . . . 5, 53<sup>4</sup>, 164f.,  
                     234, 283  
 :23 . . . . . 315, 344, 347  
 9:1 . . . . . 22, 54, 55f.,  
                     126f., 218<sup>2</sup>, 307,  
                     314, 339, 345, 404  
 :2 . . . . . 22, 339, 404  
 :3 . . . . . 22  
 :4 . . . . . 22, 409  
 :5 . . . . . 22  
 :6 . . . . . 22, 98, 178  
 :7 . . . . . 22  
 :8 . . . . . 22, 124f., 219f.,  
                     220, 221, 306, 337<sup>2</sup>,  
                     338, 339<sup>2</sup>, 352, 403  
 :9 . . . . . 23, 399  
 :10 . . . . . 23, 98, 367  
 :11 . . . . . 23, 387  
 :12 . . . . . 23, 63f., 233,  
                     388f.  
 :13 . . . . . 23, 72, 226, 406  
 :14 . . . . . 23, 82, 107f.,  
                     227, 260, 279f.  
 :15 . . . . . 23, 268, 395  
 :16 . . . . . 24, 263  
 :17 . . . . . 24, 401  
 10:1 . . . . . 26  
 :2 . . . . . 26, 359, 397  
 :3 . . . . . 23, 47<sup>3</sup>

:4 . . . . . 23, 402  
 :5 . . . . . 23, 316, 344, 347  
 :6 . . . . . 23, 62, 85, 91,  
                     231, 263  
 :7 . . . . . 23, 301f., 344,  
                     346  
 :8 . . . . . 23  
 :9 . . . . . 23, 41, 194f.,  
                     303, 334<sup>2</sup>  
 :10 . . . . . 23, 389, 399  
 :11 . . . . . 23, 27, 402  
 :12 . . . . . 10, 23, 302, 344,  
                     346  
 11:1 . . . . . 23  
 :2 . . . . . 23  
 :3 . . . . . 23  
 :4 . . . . . 23  
 :6 . . . . . 23, 91  
 :7 . . . . . 23  
 :8 . . . . . 23, 37, 139f.,  
                     203, 303f., 331,  
                     333, 344, 346  
 :9 . . . . . 23  
 :10 . . . . . 23  
 :11 . . . . . 23, 336, 345  
 :12 . . . . . 23, 336  
 :13 . . . . . 23, 334, 335,  
                     368f.  
 :14 . . . . . 23  
 :15 . . . . . 23  
 :16 . . . . . 23, 47<sup>2</sup>  
 :17 . . . . . 23  
 12:1 . . . . . 269<sup>2</sup>, 374  
 :2 . . . . . 24  
 :3 . . . . . 24  
 :4 . . . . . 24, 220<sup>2</sup>, 337, 403  
 :5 . . . . . 24, 110f., 302,  
                     344, 346  
 :6 . . . . . 24  
 :7 . . . . . 24, 263  
 :8 . . . . . 24, 52, 138f.,  
                     268, 328, 395  
 :9 . . . . . 24  
 :10 . . . . . 24, 280<sup>2</sup>, 374, 389  
 :11 . . . . . 24  
 :12 . . . . . 24  
 :13 . . . . . 24  
 :14 . . . . . 24, 338  
 13:1 . . . . . 24, 401, 402  
 :2 . . . . . 24, 356, 357, 375,  
                     398  
 :3 . . . . . 10, 24  
 :4 . . . . . 24, 398  
 :5 . . . . . 24



:6	..	24, 369f.
:7	..	23, 212, 337, 338, 368, 370, 371
:8	..	24
:9	..	10, 24, 49 <sup>2</sup> , 62, 107 <sup>2</sup> , 231, 275f.
14:1	..	24
:2	..	24, 93
:3	..	24, 310, 409
:4	..	24, 224, 225, 311
:5	..	18, 24, 27, 317
:6	..	24
:7	..	24
:8	..	24
:9	..	24, 209, 210
:10	..	24
:11	..	24
:12	..	24, 379
:13	..	24
:14	..	24
:15	..	24
:16	..	24, 209
:17	..	24, 209, 379f.
:18	..	24, 379f.
:19	..	24
:20	..	24, 395
:21	..	24, 395, 399

## Malachi

1:3	..	246
:4	..	80f., 83, 90, 153, 254, 380
:5	..	337
:6	..	7, 10, 206
:7	..	140f., 395
:8	..	395
:9	..	5, 53 <sup>3</sup> , 234
:10	..	86, 255, 257, 361, 395
:11	..	10 <sup>2</sup> , 361
:12	..	15, 16, 143, 396
:13	..	15, 86, 361
:14	..	10, 143f., 209, 372, 395
2:2	..	334, 335, 337
:3	..	68, 155f.
:5	..	10, 115, 401
:7	..	27
:9	..	262
:10	..	103 <sup>2</sup>
:11	..	16 <sup>2</sup> , 103 <sup>2</sup> , 104, 143, 384f., 393
:12	..	62, 361

:13	..	57f., 61, 177f., 222, 361, 395
:14	..	46, 103 <sup>2</sup> , 210
:15	..	103 <sup>2</sup> , 172f., 374, 375
:16	..	88ff., 90, 103 <sup>2</sup> , 104, 247, 374, 392
:17	..	46f., 50, 54, 175, 211 <sup>2</sup> , 218, 219, 258, 309
3:1	..	52, 207, 234, 285, 310, 317
:2	..	49, 280
:3	..	49, 311, 361
:4	..	87, 146, 256, 361
:5	..	46, 211, 269, 318, 344, 345
:7	..	299 <sup>2</sup> , 320, 331 <sup>2</sup> , 344, 348, 398
:8	..	104ff., 294 <sup>2</sup>
:9	..	104ff.
:10	..	106, 276
:11	..	170, 409
:12	..	336, 339
:13	..	106, 293
:14	..	6 <sup>2</sup> , 52, 234, 299 <sup>2</sup> , 344, 349
:15	..	106f., 276
:16	..	6, 7, 37 <sup>2</sup> , 52, 159f., 234, 239 <sup>3</sup>
:17	..	38, 86, 90, 192, 299 <sup>3</sup>
:18	..	299 <sup>2</sup>
4:1(3:19)	..	380f., 402
:3(3:22)	..	27
:4(3:23)	..	17, 27
:5(3:24)	..	27, 317, 371

## Wisdom

9:1	..	343
-----	----	-----

## Ecclesiasticus

42:15	..	343
-------	----	-----

## Matthew

2:15	..	368
26:31	..	370
27:3	..	369
:4	..	369
:9	..	369
:10	..	369

## Mark

14:27 . . . . . 370

## John

4:17 . . . . . 306

:21 . . . . . 306

10:10 . . . . . 133

## I Corinthians

15:52 . . . . . 227

CRANES  CREST